

ESSAYS ON
FRENCH HISTORY
—
FARMER

DC
5
F23

Cornell University Library

THE GIFT OF

James Eugene Farmer

A. 13 7597

23/5/00

Ja 17 '38

Ja 28 '38-

3-18JR

APR 17 1950

MAY 3 1950

MAR 2 1951

MAY 21 1963 M P

~~JUL 17 1973 S~~

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 100 649 528



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

Compliments of
The Author.

THE RISE OF THE REFORMATION IN
FRANCE AND ITS RELATION TO
MARTIN LUTHER.

AUTHORITIES CONSULTED.

- Merle d'Aubigné, *History of the Reformation*. New York, 1853.
- Henry M. Baird, *Rise of the Huguenots in France*. New York, 1879.
- Theod. de Bèze, *Histoire Ecclesiastique des Églises Réformées au Royaume de France*. Anvers, 1580.
- Biographie Générale*, articles : "Lefèvre d'Étaples," "Farel," etc.
- Alexander Budinszky, *Die Universität Paris*.
- Creighton, *History of the Papacy*.
- Cyclopædia of Biblical and Theological Literature*, article : "Jacobus Faber Stapulensis."
- Gieseler, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. iv. New York, 1876.
- Charles Henri Graf, *Essai sur la Vie et les Écrits de Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples*. (Thèse présentée à la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de Strasbourg, le Mardi 7 Juin 1842.) Strasbourg, 1842.
- M. Herminjard, *Correspondance des Réformateurs*, tome i.
- Jervis, *Gallican Church of France*.
- Niedner's *Zeitschrift für die Hist. Theologie*, 1852 (K. H. Graf, "Jacobus Faber Stapulensis").
- Ranke, *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France*.
- Ranke, *History of the Reformation*.
- Sismondi, *Histoire de France*. Bruxelles, 1844.
- Von Polenz, *Geschichte des französischen Calvinismus, in seiner Blüthe bis zum Aufstands von Amboise*. 1560.

ESSAYS ON FRENCH HISTORY

THE RISE OF THE REFORMATION
IN FRANCE

THE CLUB OF THE JACOBINS

BY

JAMES EUGENE FARMER, M.A.

Master in History and English, St. Paul's School
Concord, N. H.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

NEW YORK

LONDON

27 WEST TWENTY-THIRD STREET

24 BEDFORD STREET, STRAND

The Knickerbocker Press

1897



~~4096 F 88~~

A. 137597

COPYRIGHT, 1897
BY
JAMES EUGENE FARMER

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

THE RISE OF THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE AND ITS RELATION TO MARTIN LUTHER.

AT the beginning of the sixteenth century, the University of Paris was the institution of learning *par excellence* in Europe.

Its origin, lost in the mists of past ages, was attributed by popular legend, though on very doubtful authority, to the Emperor Charlemagne. With its many buildings, covering the greater part of the present *Quartier Latin*, its learned and zealous, though poorly paid, professors, its twenty odd thousand students, divided (according to their nationality) into the "nations" of France, England, Picardy, and Normandy, and its famous theological school, the Sorbonne (founded in 1250 by Robert of that name), the University of Paris had become the Mecca toward which men eager for learning were wont to wend their way.

In 1493, the faculty of this Paris University numbered among its members a certain Picard professor, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, or, as he is better known, Jacobus Faber Stapulensis.

He was, at this period, about thirty-eight years of age, having been born in 1455 at the village of Étaples in Picardy.

"It is impossible to determine," says Henri Graf,¹ "what were his first studies, or in what year he first arrived in Paris. He appears to have possessed ecclesiastical dignities and benefices but he renounced them later, and, giving to his family the property which he had at Étaples, devoted himself entirely to the study of letters and of philosophy."

He had travelled much in Europe and in Asia—for the considerable fortune² which he possessed enabled him to do so,—and though he had received a "barbarous education," as Theodore Beza³ calls it, yet genius supplied in him the want of better instruction and, confining his attention to no single branch of learning, he had acquired proficiency in mathematics, in biblical literature, and in astronomy. Among

¹ Charles Henri Graf, *Essai sur la Vie de Jacques Lefèvre*, p. 5.

² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

³ Theod. de Bèze, *Histoire Ecclésiastique des Églises Réformées*.

his numerous scientific works, he has left us an astronomical treatise and an introduction and commentary on the arithmetic of Boëthius.¹

“He lived ordinarily at Paris, and acquired a great reputation by his lessons² in mathematics and especially by those in astronomy. The most distinguished men of the period were his pupils, and the friends of letters honored him,

¹ *Ouvrages publiées par Lefèvre avant 1517* (after Henri Graf, pp. 14-20):

(1) *Aristotelis philosophiæ naturalis Paraphrases et Introductio in sex primos libros metaphysicos*, etc. (1501, 1504, 1521).

(2) *Aristotelis Opus metaphysicum Bessarione Card. interprete XIV. libris distinctum, cum commentariis Argyropyli Byzant. in XII. primos* (1515).

(3) *Meteorologia Aristotelis cum J. Fabri St. paraphrasi et commentar* (1512).

(4) *Artificialis Introductio per modum Epitomatis in decem libros Ethicorum Aristotelis cum Comment.* (1502, 1506, 1512).

(5) *Decem libri Ethic. Arist. ex trad. Argyropylium Fabri comment.* (1514, 1522).

(6) *Epitome compendiosaque Introductio in libros arithmeticos D. Severini Boëtii cum Clitovei commentario Astronomico, alia opuscula* (1503, 1510, 1522, 1549).

(7) *Arithmetica Jordani Nemorarii, Musica IV. libris demonstrata, Epitome in Arith. Boëtii, Rhythmimachia ludus qui et pugna numerorum appellatur* (1514).

(8) *Proverbia Raymundi Lulli ejd. philosophia amoris. Jod. Bad. Ascens.* (1516).

(9) *Richardi quondam devoti Cœnobitæ S. Victoris de Trinitate Opus theologicum cum comment.* (1510).

(The foregoing list does not include all the works published by Lefèvre prior to 1517.)

² Read “lectures.”

regarding him as the restorer of the true philosophy of Aristotle. Louis XII. esteemed him, and the great nobles also, who, in imitation of the Italian princes, had begun to favor letters and protect scholars."¹

Enjoying thus in France and abroad a reputation for profound learning second to no man of his time (Erasmus himself places him first),² Lefèvre had collected about him a number of the more studious members of the University of Paris who were his devoted followers. There was nothing pleasing in his small, meagre person, but those with whom he came in contact soon lost sight of the unattractiveness of the outward man in contemplating the brilliancy of his wonderfully active mind. In the year 1489, near the town of Gap in Dauphiné, was born in the family of Farel a son whom they named Guillaume. His parents, well-to-do and very pious people, were devout servants of the papacy and the young Guillaume and his brothers and sisters were brought up in "all the observances of Romish devotion."³ Young Farel possessed a penetrating mind and a lively

¹ Graf, *Essai*, etc., pp. 9-11.

² Merle d'Aubigné, *History of the Reformation*, p. 334.

³ Guillaume Farel, *Du Vray Usage de la Croix* (after D'Aubigné).

imagination and early evinced a desire for knowledge—to know something beyond his rosary and his sword, then considered sufficient education for the young provincial *noblesse* of his class. He asked permission to devote himself to study. This plan did not agree at all with the course his father desired to mark out for him. He would have had his son follow in the footsteps of his fellow-countryman, the Dauphinèse Du Terrail, who had just then, at the battle of the Tar, given a signal display of that courage which was in after years to win him the proud title of *Bayard, le chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*. Young Farel, however, persevered in his entreaties. His father's objections finally gave way and, in 1510, Guillaume set out for the University of Paris.

There he applied himself diligently to study and was constantly to be seen in the churches praying to some saint, chanting the mass, or devoutly repeating his hours. Among those who, like himself, were engaged in these pious duties, Farel soon noticed an aged man who, more than all others, struck him by the "great reverence with which he sang the mass." He became anxious to meet this reverent pilgrim and, upon learning that he was no other

than the celebrated professor of the Paris University, Jacques Lefèvre, his desire to know him increased the more. Great was his joy therefore when he was cordially received by Lefèvre and allowed to join the number of those favored ones who were wont to gather knowledge from his teachings. It seemed very unlikely at that time that these two men, Jacques Lefèvre and Guillaume Farel, were to be ere long the beginners of the Reformation in France. Lefèvre was scrupulous in the performance of his religious duties, especially devout in his attendance at mass, assiduous in his devotion to the Virgin Mary, and, in his zeal for the Church, had undertaken to compile the lives of the saints whose names appear in the Roman calendar. Farel, brought up in the strictest teachings of Romish belief, was so impregnated with its doctrines that, as he himself tells us, "Pope and papal Church were not so papal as he."

"In truth the papacy was not and is not so papal as my heart has been," he says, "for so effectually had it blinded my eyes and perverted my being, that if any person had been approved by the Pope he appeared to me like a God, and if any one said or did

anything against the Pope, or his authority, I would have wished such an one to be ruined and destroyed.”¹

It was some time before either he or Lefèvre arrived at any clear understanding of the truth. A closer study of the Scriptures had, however, somewhat shaken Lefèvre's devotion to the teachings of the Romish Church and, laying aside the collection of the legends of the saints and martyrs, upon which he had been engaged, he turned eagerly to the study of the Bible and, in 1508, completed a Latin commentary upon the Psalms.² Farel too had begun to study the Old and the New Testaments and his belief was much shaken at seeing the scriptural doctrines so different from those in which he had been taught to have faith. “Alas,” said he, fearing to read more,³ “I do not well understand these things. I must give a very different meaning to the Scriptures from that which they seem to have. I must keep to the interpretation of the Church and indeed of the

¹ Farel, *Épître à tous Seigneurs et Peuples*, p. 164 (after Baird, p. 70).

² “Le premier travail que Lefèvre entreprit sur la Bible fut une édition comparative des différentes versions latines des Psaumes avec un commentaire, qu’ il acheva à Saint-Germain-des-Prés, en 1508.” Graf, *Essai*, etc., p. 22.

³ *Oculos demittens visis non credebam.*—Farellus Natali Galeoto.

Pope," and he turned again with greater fervor to his Romish devotion. But light was now coming to Lefèvre, and by means of Lefèvre it was ere long to come to Farel.

In 1512, Lefèvre published his famous *Commentary upon the Epistles of St. Paul*,¹ con-

¹ "Opinions de Lefèvre sur les Dogmes et les Pratiques de l'Église dans son *Commentaire sur les Épîtres de St. Paul*."—Graf, *Essai*, etc., pp. 61-80.

"It is interesting to examine," he says, "what his opinions were upon some of the principal points which were shortly to cause such profound schism between the Catholic and Protestant churches, before the time when Luther put his hand to that reformatory movement of which men had for so long felt the need. We find these opinions in his *Commentary upon the Epistles of St. Paul*, where, without ever passing the bounds of mildness and moderation, he does not fear to openly express the sentiments which the study of the Apostolic writings suggests to him. He is far from having a doctrine developed after a rigorous manner upon the reports of free will and of grace, of faith and of works, but in following the precepts of Paul he does not at all lose sight of those of John and of the Evangelists. 'As Adam, by the sin which he committed, brought death upon himself and thus gave death entrance into the world, thus all those who have sinned—in eo in quo peccaverunt,—that is to say by their own sin or by the cause of their own sin, have brought death upon themselves. And thus the Apostle does not appear to wish to say that all have sinned, since he adds that death has reigned from the time of Adam to Moses upon those who have not sinned. Thus they who have not sinned at all are dead also, not on account of sin but from likeness to the disobedience of Adam. Christ is the source of all justification, Adam the covering of all disobedience. The likeness of Christ is life, the likeness of Adam, death. The works of faith are the signs of faith, of a living faith which gives justification. There are here two parts; one confines itself to works, the other to faith regardless of works. John refutes one, Paul the other. And you, if you have honesty of

cerning which he wrote to Briçonnet,¹ Bishop of Meaux, on the 15th of December of that year, as follows: ² "When we read these commentaries we should the less regard the men who have composed them, in order that we may the more find in them signs of spiritual life and true nourishment for the soul. On the contrary, it is then that we should recognize the divine virtue that descends from on high and Him from whom it truly proceeds, and, having recognized it, we should struggle with

heart, will have confidence neither in faith nor works, but in God. Seek first to obtain the salvation of God by faith after Paul and then add works to faith after John, since they are the signs of a living faith.' "

¹ "Guillaume Briçonnet était issu d'une famille dont plusieurs membres s'étaient illustrés dans des dignités ecclésiastiques et séculiers ; il était fils de Guillaume Briçonnet, cardinal, évêque de Saint-Malo, qui, devenu ensuite archevêque de Rheims, sacra Louis XII. en 1498, et mourut comme archevêque de Narbonne en 1514. Il fut élève de Lefèvre ainsi que son cousin François Briçonnet, maître de la chambre aux deniers du roi. Comme évêque de Lodeve il s'enfermait souvent des journées entières dans son cabinet avec Clitou, pour goûter à loisir les plaisirs de l'étude. En 1507 son père en passant de l'archevêché de Rheims à celui de Narbonne, lui céda l'abbaye de Saint-Germain-des-Prés. Briçonnet offrit alors à Lefèvre un asile sur et tranquille dans son abbaye, et lui fournit tout ce dont il pouvait avoir besoin pour s'occuper uniquement de ses études et de ses travaux littéraires. C'est là que Lefèvre écrivit son ouvrage le plus important, son *Commentaire sur les Épîtres de Saint-Paul*, ainsi que son *Psautier quintuple*."—Graf, *Essai*, etc., pp. 11, 12.

² Herminjard, *Correspondance des Réformateurs*, i., pp. 2-9.

ourselves that we may follow it with all purity of heart and with all the piety of which we are capable, since that is the only means of approaching Him who does all in all. The world will be cursed for its work ; it will never yield anything but thorns and thistles ; consequently what we may do as the result of our new birth is not at all our work but that of a divine benediction. Those who shall comprehend that these Epistles are a gift from God will make real progress. Since Paul is but an instrument — ‘ You seek in me,’ he says himself, ‘ the proof that Christ speaks in me.’ It is here in fact that Christ’s doctrine appears and not that of any other. It follows therefore that those who shall study it will drink with joy, as the divine oracle says, of the water at the fountain-head of salvation. Those therefore who shall undertake this study with devout sentiments will make progress in piety, not through Paul, or any other man, but through Christ and His divine Spirit.”

Simon, in his *Observations on the New Testament*, remarks that “ Jacques Lefèvre deserves to be ranked among the most skilful commentators of the age,”¹ and Merle d’Au-

¹ D’Aubigné, iii., p. 339 (note).

bigné is disposed to give him even greater praise. But, however worthy of commendation he may have been as a commentator, it is certain that in his writings upon the Pauline epistles he clearly announces, five years prior to the publication of Luther's theses, the doctrine of justification by faith,—the cardinal doctrine of the Reformation.

Lefèvre's writings, however, were addressed to scholars and to men of letters and created no such loud-sounding stir as did Luther's bold action at Wittenberg, and Lefèvre himself was a man of a quiet and retiring frame of mind, who, at this time and for several years afterward, was zealous in the performance of the duties demanded of him by the Romish Church. The idea of engaging in any open contest with that Church would have filled him with no little alarm. His work was to prepare the ground and sow the seed; it was in his ardent and courageous pupil, Guillaume Farel, that France was to find her Luther. But the aged Lefèvre, though he but faintly perceived how the light just then breaking was to increase, illuminating the darkness of superstition and ignorance, yet felt that a change was at hand, and Farel was much impressed by the

earnestness with which he one day took him by the hand, saying, "Guillaume, the world is going to be renewed, and you will see it!"¹

What was the condition of this "world" whose regeneration was thus so solemnly predicted?

In Rome, Giovanni de' Medici, under his title of Leo X., had succeeded the Borgia and Julius II. upon the papal throne, and while Michael Angelo reared the great dome of Saint Peter's and adorned the Sistine Chapel with its glories, and Raphael traced his frescos on the walls of the Vatican, Leo, the profligate patron of the arts, proceeded to carry out his maxim, uttered in 1513 when he received the news of his election, "Since God has given us the papacy, let us enjoy it!" In Germany, Maximilian, King of the Romans, was still hoping to get himself crowned, and so change his title of Emperor-Electus into Emperor; in Spain, Ferdinand the Catholic had united in his person the crowns of Aragon and Castile; in England, Henry VIII. had succeeded his father upon the throne of the Tudors; and in France, Louis XII., dying on the 1st of January, 1515, had left his crown—

¹ Herminjard, i., p. 481; Farel to Pellican (1556).

a splendid New Year's gift—to his son-in-law, Francis of Valois, the young and dashing Count of Angoulême.

Superstition, idolatry, ignorance, and misery darkened all these lands.

In France, the belief in astrology was almost universal, and Nostradamus and like pretenders gained wealth and honor. Sorcery, by means of waxen images, and the pernicious credit enjoyed by charms and incantations were not confined to the poor and ignorant, but found favor with the *bourgeois* and *haute noblesse*.

Throughout the length and breadth of the land, in more than three thousand bishoprics, thirty thousand abbeys, and forty thousand convents were heaped up the pictures, images, and relics of the saints. In one church, the hair of the blessed Virgin received humble adoration ; in another, the sword of the archangel Michael was reverently regarded. The cathedral of St. Denis gloried in the possession of the entire body of St. Dionysius, and it would have gone hard with any unbeliever who should have ventured to call attention to the fact that, more than a hundred years previously, the Pope had solemnly declared that

the good town of Ratisbon possessed the only true entire body of this holy saint. Dionysius at Ratisbon received no greater homage than Dionysius at St. Denis.

The arm of St. Anthony (which unfortunately turned out later to be the bone of a deer) was highly regarded at Geneva, and at Arles the people rejoiced in the possession of the very stones that killed St. Stephen. Lyons, however, surpassed all competitors and presented to her faithful flocks no less a rarity than the twelve combs of the Apostles, which became the objects of special veneration. Nails and pieces of the true cross abounded everywhere, and numberless miracles stimulated the popular faith. Even superstitions of heathen origin remained undisturbed, for homage was paid to Isis, and an "Apollo received worship at Polignac."¹

The Church possessed immense riches, and the Venetian Ambassador, Michel Surriano, has estimated that out of the total revenue of France, then amounting to fifteen million golden crowns, six millions went to the Church. Non-residence was a standing reproach to all the clergy, and of the thirteen French cardi-

¹ Farel, *Du Vray Usage*, etc.

nals in the papal consistory some were the incumbents of as many as ten bishoprics and abbeys.

The archbishops, bishops, and cardinals lived at Court ; the abbots and priors, in the larger cities, and busy in the pursuit of pleasure and self-aggrandizement they cared nothing for the welfare of the peoples committed to their charge.

The typical clergyman of that day was a high liver ; in the sumptuousness of his table and the brilliancy of his hunting equipage he frequently surpassed the grand seigneur, and with his horses, his hounds, his wine, and his mistresses, his one object was to make life pass merrily. All matters of faith were discussed in Latin, as this language alone was deemed worthy of such honor. French, which the common people could understand, was generally condemned, and to the reformers belongs the honor of having elevated it to the highest literary uses.

Such was the state of religion in the France of 1515—the France of Jacques Lefèvre and of Guillaume Farel.

“It is sufficient to say,” says M. Herminjard, in his *Correspondence of the Reformers*,

“ that, with the exception of the first symptoms, we can hardly place at least the decisive beginnings of the French Reformation prior to the year 1520. Until about that period Lefèvre was still only*the fore-runner. The sentiments and convictions manifested in his *Commentary* of 1512, disclosed without doubt a spirit much attracted to the Gospel, but the influence of that writing was very restricted, and the Sorbonne, far from condemning the doctrines that would infallibly cause the book to produce some fermentation in public opinion, contented themselves by denouncing that portion of the *Commentary* in which the author maintains that the Latin translation of the New Testament was the work of St. Jerome. The *Commentary* of 1512 was but the very imperfect prelude to the *Manifestation of the Gospel*.”¹

Although Lefèvre had, in his *Commentary*, clearly stated a cardinal point of the Protestant doctrine, yet he was by no means ready to break away entirely from his Romish beliefs and light came to him only by degrees. In 1514, he was still steadfast in his devotion to images and pictures; in 1516, Luther, in a letter to Spalatin,² stated that although he con-

¹ Herminjard, i., p. 239 (note).

² *Ibid.*, i., p. 26 (Luther to Spalatin, Oct. 19, 1516).

sidered Lefèvre a very sincere and pious man, yet he thought him deficient in apprehending spiritual truth ; and as late as 1519, Glareanus, writing on the 13th of January to Zwingli at Zurich, informed him that Lefèvre had begun a legend of the saints. Farel on the other hand, owing to the light given him by Lefèvre, had begun to study the Bible earnestly again, had undertaken as well the study of Greek and Hebrew, and was now making rapid progress. He had been much impressed in 1512 when the young Allmain, doctor in the Paris University, had, in a brilliant speech and amid much applause, refuted the assertions of the Cardinal Thomas de Vio, who had written a book to prove that the Pope was the absolute monarch of the Church. "It was necessary," says Farel, "that popery should have fallen little by little from my heart, for it did not tumble down at the first shock." ¹

It was by means of Farel's arguments that, in 1519, Lefèvre was finally induced to abandon saint-worship and the prayers for the dead.² The Picard professor, however, soon found himself in difficulty with the Sorbonne. In the

¹ Farel, *À tous Seigneurs*, etc.

² Herminjard, i., p. 41.

year 1518, he had published a treatise entitled *The Three Marys*, in which he sought to prove that Mary the sister of Lazarus, Mary Magdalene, and "the woman which was a sinner," were not one and the same person, as people then commonly believed them to be. But the Sorbonne were little disposed to tolerate this innovation. On the 31st of October, 1517, Luther had nailed his ninety-five theses to the church door at Wittenberg and the effect of that bold act had been to shake into vigorous activity all the theologians of Christendom, and on the 15th of April, 1521, the Sorbonne had solemnly declared Luther's writings to be seductive, contrary to Scripture, a denial of the first principles of faith, and had condemned them to be burned. They had compared his last work, *De Captivitate Babylonica*, to the *Alcoran*, and announced that it was preposterous to suppose that God had, after so many centuries, destined Martin Luther to discover the only means of salvation, and that, in opposing a heresy so arrogant and impious, discussion was useless ; it could be refuted only by the *ultima ratio*,—chains, torture, and the stake. The Sorbonne, therefore, were not in a frame of mind to countenance any departure from es-

tablished doctrine, however slight, and, moreover, it was an unpardonable offence in their eyes that Jacques Lefèvre, "a simple Master of Arts, should presume to investigate matters that they considered fell to the province of Doctors of Theology alone."¹ Consequently on the 9th of November, 1521, they declared that whoever should maintain the truth of Lefèvre's proposition was a heretic, and it might have gone hard with Lefèvre himself had not Guillaume Petit, the King's confessor, induced royalty to interfere in his behalf.

In the year 1521, the diocese of Meaux, a little over twenty miles from Paris, had as its bishop a certain Guillaume Briçonnet, son of the old Cardinal of St. Malo who had been Archbishop of Rheims and, in virtue of that dignity, had anointed King Louis XII. at his coronation. The Cardinal was now dead, but his son had inherited a good measure of the royal favor his father had enjoyed and, having been created Archdeacon of Rheims and Abbot of St. Germain-des-Prés, he had been appointed,

¹ Herminjard, i., p. 51 (H. C. Agrippa, 1519). As it clearly appears that Lefèvre was not a doctor of the Sorbonne, Professor Soldan is mistaken in saying: "*Seit 1493 lebte er als Doctor der Theologie zu Paris.*" "The error is of long standing."—Baird, i., p. 72 (note).

in March, 1516, Bishop of Meaux by King Francis I.

Shortly after, he had been sent as special French envoy to the Court of Rome, and a close acquaintance with the papal Church had revealed to him many things in which he thought there was urgent need of reform. Upon returning to his diocese he determined to begin there his work of reformation. Who, among his friends, could better assist him in his task, than the learned Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, whose zeal he well knew, and with whose writings he was well acquainted? He therefore sent an invitation to Lefèvre to come to Meaux and aid him in his work, and Lefèvre, who was weary of the denunciations of the Sorbonne and of the outcry against Luther and his doctrines with which Paris was filled,¹ was glad to accept his offer.

In the summer of 1521 he went, therefore, to Meaux, and was soon joined there by Farel, Michel d'Arande, Gerard Roussel, and some of his other pupils.

From the time when the reformers made their appearance in Meaux new activity was awakened in the religious life of the diocese.

¹ Herminjard, i., p. 71 (Glareanus to Zwingli, July 4, 1521).

The pulpits were now no longer filled, as formerly, with mendicant monks, begging contributions and relating stories from the *Golden Legend*, but with zealous preachers who explained the Gospel. The new-born zeal of Bishop Briçonnet, too, had received much encouragement from the fact that since Lefèvre's arrival he had been visited, in October, 1521, by Louisa of Savoy and her daughter, the Princess Margaret of Angoulême, the mother and sister of King Francis, who had confirmed him in his projected reforms and promised him their support. In confirmation of this promise, Margaret had written him in November as follows: "Be assured that the King and Madame have fully decided to let it be understood that the truth of God is not at all heresy,"¹ and, in December, she had written again: "Your pious wishes for the reformation of the Church are more than ever desired by Madame and the King."¹

And now let us leave the reformers to begin their work at Meaux under the powerful patronage of Bishop Briçonnet, who was delighting in his sunshine of royal approval, while we

¹ Herminjard, i., pp. 78, 84 (Margaret to Briçonnet, Nov., Dec., 1521).

glance for a moment at the writer of these letters, and at "Madame and the King."

Margaret of Valois, born at Angoulême on the 11th of April, 1492, had passed her childhood in the city of her birth. Her mother, Louisa of Savoy, a woman of vigorous temperament, was possessed with great desire for power, and since, in her opinion, Louis XII., in his pliability toward his Parliament, had resigned too many of the rights of the Crown, she had, during the latter years of his reign, been in open opposition to the Court. Margaret, if her portraits speak truly, was not handsome; her features were large, and her nose almost as conspicuous as the one which gained her brother Francis his famous sobriquet of *le roi au long nez*, but the good qualities of her heart gave to her countenance a sweetness of expression that might sometimes take the place of beauty.

She had early applied herself to study, had become proficient in German and in Latin, and knew something of Greek and Hebrew. She was somewhat of a poet, too, and her intercourse with the greatest living literary lights of her day had made her a writer of no mean pretensions, as she was one day to give proof in her *Heptameron*, that compendium of vice and vir-

tue, of religious exhortation and of tap-room stories, in the combination of which the author's purpose still remains a riddle.¹ She had been married, in 1509, to the Duc d'Alençon, who was ere long to prove himself a coward on the battle-field of Pavia and die disgraced at Lyons, and then she was to wed King Henri d'Albret and, in her little kingdom near the Pyrenees, offer Lefèvre a refuge in his old age, rear her daughter, Jeanne d'Albret, to womanhood, and have one day a grandson who would prove himself a gallant soldier, find "Paris worth a mass," set up a Bourbon dynasty, and become the white-plumed knight of Ivry, King Henry of Navarre.

Her brother Francis, Count of Angoulême, had been born at Cognac on the 12th of September, 1494, and was, therefore, in his twenty-first year when he succeeded Louis XII. on the French throne. His tall figure, broad shoulders, long brown hair, ruddy complexion, and princely bearing, all betokened health, enjoyment of life, and consciousness of his royal position. He delighted in the chase, and none, save perhaps his friend La Marck, "the

¹ See remarks of Mr. Baird on the *Heptameron* in his *Rise of the Huguenots*, pp. 119-121 (note).

Boar of the Ardennes," followed it more fearlessly. He excelled, too, in knightly feats of arms and could break a lance with the most skilful of his Court. To his valor he added a taste for letters, patronized artists and scholars, declared Leonardo da Vinci to be the most learned man he knew, had Serlio and Rosso rear and adorn his palaces, and, in his castles of Chambord, Fontainebleau, and Amboise, collected about him a brilliant Court which displayed much of that splendor which was to become so marked a feature of the French nobility, one hundred and fifty years later, in the reign of the *Grand Monarque*.

It was a great blow to Francis's pride when he lost the election to the Holy Roman Empire in 1519, and, although he told Charles V.'s ambassadors that Charles and he were "like two friends in love with the same lady, and that whichever one she accepted, the other must submit and not feel hurt,"¹ he was far from acquiescing thus in his defeat. From that time a struggle for supremacy began between them—a struggle in which the cool, calculating Charles, and not the bold, impetuous Francis, reaped the solid fruits of

¹ Sismondi, *Histoire de France*, tome xi., p. 218.

victory. As may be imagined, Francis had no very deep religious convictions. He was not particularly attached to the Romish Church or to the Pope, and he looked with contempt upon the ignorant monks. The new doctrines appeared, at first, somewhat attractive to him from the fact that they were generally presented by men of learning, but circumstances soon tended to destroy this favorable impression. He was constantly reminded, by those whose interest it was to do so, that "a change of religion necessarily involved a change of prince"—a false political maxim made much of in that century. The papal Nuncio, too,—when Francis, in a fit of anger against the Pope, one day told him that he might follow Henry VIII.'s example and permit the spread of the new doctrines in France,—answered craftily: "Sire, to speak with all frankness, you would be the first to repent your rash step. Your loss would be greater than the Pope's, for a new religion, established in the midst of a people, involves nothing short of a change of prince."

This reasoning had much weight with Francis, who meant to have no change of prince while he lived, and whose theory of

absolute government was summed up in the reply he made to Charles V. who, when in France, asked him what revenue he derived from certain towns and received the prompt answer, *Ce que je veux!*—(What I please).¹ But though Francis had no great regard for the Romish Church he was anxious to take advantage of the influence that the Pope exerted on European politics, and, moreover, the strict code of morals established by the reformers was not pleasing to a monarch who was accustomed openly to neglect his wife and bow at the shrine of Madame la Duchesse d'Étampes, of Diane de Poitiers, or of some other fair lady of his Court. Thus these various influences combined to cause a prince, who had many good qualities—who, according to even the biographer² of his imperial rival, was “humane, beneficent, generous, and possessed dignity without pride, affability free from meanness, and courtesy exempt from deceit”—to become, against his better inclinations and sometimes his own advantage, the persecutor and enemy of the re-

¹ Cayet, *Histoire de la Guerre sous Henri IV.* (after Baird).

² Robertson, *Charles V.*, iii., p. 396, (after Baird, p. 101).

formed faith which he had at first seemed much disposed to favor.

Shortly after his arrival at Meaux, Lefèvre, who had relinquished to his friends and followers the more active work of preaching, began the task of translating the Bible from the Latin Vulgate into the French language.¹ In that day scholars only could gain a knowledge of the Bible by reading the Latin Vulgate, and the common people, who understood French alone, had at their disposal nothing but an incomplete version in which text and gloss were badly mixed. On the 8th of June, 1523,² Lefèvre published a translation of the four Gospels, and later in the same year the remainder of the New Testament, and five years after, in 1528, he added a translation of the Old Testament.

¹ "The only printed work in favor of which the claim of Lefèvre's translation to be the oldest in the French language could be disputed is the *Bible* of Guyars des Moulins, finished in 1297, and printed by order of Charles VIII., in 1487; but the greater part of this is a free translation, not of the Scriptures themselves, but of a summary—the *Historia Scholastica* of Pierre le Mangeur (latinized Comestor)—and is consequently no Bible at all. See M. Chas. Read, in *Bulletin*, i., 76, who remarks that 'everything considered, it may therefore be asserted that the translations of Lefèvre d'Étaples and of Olivetanus are the first versions without embellishment or gloss (*non historiées et non glossées*).'"—Baird, p. 78, (note).

² Brunet's *Manuel*, vol. v., p. 747.

"It was a magnificent undertaking," says Baird, "and prompted by a fervent desire to promote the spiritual interests of his fellow-countrymen. In its execution, the inaccuracies incident* to so novel an enterprise, and the comparative harshness of the style, can readily be forgiven. For, aside from its own merits, the version of Lefèvre d'Étaples formed the basis for the subsequent version of Robert Olivetanus."¹ This publication of the Scrip-

¹ Graf, in his article on Jacobus Faber Stapulensis (*Niedner, Zeitschrift für die Hist. Theologie*, 1852, pp. 215-221), gives us the following facts regarding the translation of Olivetanus. The year following the Antwerp Bible (1534), which was the second edition of Lefèvre's Bible, Robert Olivetanus published at Neuenburg a French translation of the Bible. In the preface to it he referred to several Greek translations, Latin translations, three German translations, two Italian translations, and several of other peoples, but it is curious that, among all these, no mention is made of any translation in French. Olivetanus pretends to have translated it in one year. Upon comparing it with Lefèvre's Bible we find a difference in the arrangement of the books. In the Old Testament of Lefèvre, the Apocrypha is arranged as in the Vulgate, while in the version of Olivetanus the Apocrypha is separated and put after the Canonical books. In the translation of the New Testament of Olivetanus we find only that of Faber (Lefèvre) partly unchanged; partly improved (after Erasmus)—(*Die Uebersetzung des Neuen Testaments unverändert, theils ganz, bei Olivetan ist aber nichts anderes als die des Faber, theils nach Erasmus verbessert.*—*Ibid.*, p. 218). There are, in the version of Olivetanus, very few traces that tend to show that he compared his work with the Greek text. Wherever a change is found it is generally a slavish copying of Erasmus, carried even to the point of inserting his mistakes. The Apocrypha, in Olivetanus's version, is

tures aroused great enthusiasm among the common people. Copies of the New Testament were eagerly bought, and Bishop Briçonnet, in many cases, supplied those who could not afford to purchase them. The people heard now, with wonder and joy, the Bible read in the churches in a language they could understand.

"How can we help rejoicing," wrote Lefèvre to Farel in 1524, "when we see the pure knowledge of Christ already scattered abroad in a great part of Europe? I have also some good news to give you. The New Testament, translated into French, has been received with extraordinary eagerness by the simple people

simply a reprint of Lefèvre even where the sense of the original is quite mistaken. The few changes are merely improvements in French expressions. In short Olivetan's version is, in the Old Testament, original, for he did this from the Hebrew with the help of a Latin translation of Santes Pagninus, and he was evidently a much better scholar in Hebrew than in Greek; his Apocrypha is a copy of Lefèvre's, and his New Testament is after Lefèvre's, changed somewhat by following Erasmus. At present the common Bibles used in France (among Protestants) are the later revisions of Martin and of Ostervald, which are not so much improvements, from a scholarly point of view, as paler reproductions of the originals. Calvin improved Olivetan's translation, and, in 1551, Olivetan's translation of the Psalms was replaced by one of Budæus. In 1560, Faber's translation of the Apocrypha was replaced by one by Beza. Beza and Calvin several times revised the New Testament, and in 1588, Bertram issued a thorough revision of the whole Bible.

of our diocese to whom it is read on Sundays and fête-days. The King has removed the obstacles which certain persons desired to place in the way of this diffusion of the Word."¹

But the Romish Church, with its great possessions, its political influence, its pomp, and its prestige, was not to give way to the spread of new doctrines without tremendous resistance. When upon one occasion Lefèvre, in a dispute with some of the staunch supporters of the old order of things, remarked that "the Gospel was already winning the hearts of nobles and common people alike, and that soon it would spread all over France, casting down the inventions which the hand of man had set up," the Dominican monk, De Roma, answered him angrily. "In that event," he cried, "I and others like me will preach a crusade and drive the King from his kingdom by means of his own subjects if he permits the Gospel to be preached!"² It was the same threat that the papal Nuncio had intended to convey when he remarked to Francis, "Sire, a new religion involves nothing short of a change of prince."

¹ Herminjard, i., p. 220 (Lefèvre to Farel).

² *Ibid.*, p. 483.

This language of De Roma was pleasing to the Franciscans, who were violently opposed to the reformers and whose animosity had been increased by the fact that Bishop Briçonnet had prohibited them from entering any pulpit within his jurisdiction. They sought the aid of the University of Paris and of Parliament, and the Sorbonne, who had been denounced as "Pharisees" and "false prophets" by the Bishop of Meaux, were very ready to aid them in attacking him and his reformers vigorously.

Before the combined attacks of his enemies, Bishop Briçonnet gave way. His faith had never been of the firmest and, upon the evidence of a strong supporter of the Romish Church, we are told that early in his reformed preaching he gave his congregation the following warning: "Even should I, your Bishop, change my speech and teaching, beware you change not with me!"¹ He could not now, in the face of Romish opposition, follow the example Luther had set, in 1521, at the Diet of Worms, when, before emperor, papal legates, bishops, cardinals, and electors, he had uttered

¹ Fontaine, *Histoire Catholique* (after Merle d'Aubigné), and Herminjard, i., p. 158.

his memorable, "*Hie stehe ich, ich kann nicht anders, Gott helf mir, Amen!*" ("Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise, God help me, Amen!")¹ Bishop Briçonnet therefore wavered and finally yielded entirely and permitted to be published in his name pastoral letters which condemned and denounced Martin Luther and his works.

The first of these—a "Synodal Decree"—declared Luther to be a man plotting to overthrow "the estate which keeps all the rest in the path of duty," (*L'état qui contient tous les autres dans le devoir*)²; and another denounced certain preachers who, "brought in by himself to share his pastoral cares, had dared, in defiance of the evangelical truth, to preach that purgatory does not exist, and that, consequently, we must not pray for the dead, nor invoke the very holy Virgin Mary and the saints"³; while a third, which revoked the powers granted to "Lutheran preachers," was as follows: "There can be no better occasion to observe with profit this sacred and inviolable decree than at the present time when the Lu-

¹ Gieseler, vol. iv., p. 57 (note).

² Herminjard, i., p. 154.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

theran plague has increased beyond measure and will go on scattering its poison everywhere unless we firmly check the violence of its course by the remedy necessary for so great an evil. For these reasons we write to you all in general, and to each of you in particular, and, by the terror of these presents, expressly prohibit you, under pain of excommunication and anathema, from allowing to preach in your pulpits Lutherans of this sort, and all others, of whatever degree of pre-eminence or quality they may be, who make profession of the same doctrines which are to remain unknown to you.”¹ Though the first two of these documents bear date of October 15, 1523, and the last that of December 13th, of the same year, the time of their actual publication is involved in some obscurity. It is probable that it should be placed nearly two years later. Even at the close of 1524, if we may believe a letter of Pierre de Sebeville, written on the 28th of December, Lefèvre and Briçonnet were “breaking images in the churches at Meaux.”²

Briçonnet's defection compelled the reformers, whom he had invited to assist him,

¹ Herminjard, i., p. 171.

² *Ibid.*, p. 315 (Sebeville au Coct, Dec. 28, 1524).

to depart from Meaux. Farel had apparently left as early as 1523, though "neither the reason nor the precise time of his departure is known,"¹ and after visiting his native Dauphiné, he had gone to Switzerland and begun his labors at Basle and Strasbourg. The year 1525, therefore, opened gloomily for the reformers,—Briçonnet was returning to his old faith, Lefèvre was becoming intimidated at the outcry raised against him, Farel had been compelled to depart,—and for France the new year soon proved even more disastrous. On the 24th of February the French, who had gone forth hoping to repeat in Italy the triumphs of 1515 and win another Marignano, had met, instead, complete defeat at Pavia. The gallant army that had passed the Alps was lost; and Francis, fighting bravely until thrown from his horse, had been compelled to surrender his sword to Charles Lannoy, of Naples, and, with all his dreams of conquest vanished, found himself a prisoner in the hands of his Imperial rival, the Emperor Charles of Spain.

In this predicament he announced to his regent-mother, Louisa of Savoy, the extent of

¹ Baird, i., p. 83, note.

his misfortunes, not in the traditional sentence, *Tout est perdu fors l'honneur* ("All is lost save honor"), but in the following letter: "Madame, that you may know to what extent I have suffered misfortune, of all things there is nothing left me but honor and life saved."¹

On a Sunday in March, 1525, a paper was distributed in the churches of Paris which asked and answered the following question: "Do you wish to know who is to blame for all our misfortunes? Well, it is Lady Ambition and her Chancellor."² Thus it designated the Regent, Louisa of Savoy, and the Chancellor, Duprat, Archbishop of Sens. The policy of the Government, after the disasters of 1525, was no longer one of tolerance toward the reformed faith. The advisers of the Regent were not slow in telling her that the misfortunes of France were a divine punishment upon Francis for having tolerated "heresy." Had he endeavored vigorously to repress it in the start, he would not now, they argued, be prisoner at Madrid. And if she desired a return of the divine blessing, she must prove

¹ *Papiers d'État du Card. de Granvelle*, i., p. 258 (after Baird, 173, note).

² Ranke, *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France*, p. 95.

herself a good Catholic and take measures to crush utterly the damnable doctrines of Luther throughout her realm. These arguments had much weight with the Regent, who felt that "the support of Clement VII., now specially needed in the delicate diplomacy lying immediately before her, could best be secured by proving to the Pontiff's satisfaction that the House of Valois was clear of all suspicion of harboring or fostering the Lutheran doctrines and their adherents." ¹

A commission, which was in reality a form of the Inquisition and contained many of its objectionable features, was appointed by the Parliament of Paris toward the close of March, 1525, and Pope Clement VII. soon gave them his unqualified approval. They ordered Jacques Lefèvre to appear before them and commanded Gerard Roussel to be seized wherever found, even at the altar (*etiam in loco sacro*).² Thus beset by dangers these reformers, in October, 1525, left Meaux and sought refuge at Strasbourg. There Lefèvre met again his pupil Guillaume Farel, who was ardently beginning his labors in French

¹ Baird, p. 124.

² *Registres du Parlement*, Oct. 3, 1525 (after Baird, p. 84, note).

Switzerland. But the now aged Lefèvre lacked the courage of his more fearless disciple, and, while Farel pushed on his work with eagerness, Lefèvre drew back, since he feared to break the last tie which bound him to the Church of Rome. "I have spoken to Lefèvre and Roussel," wrote Pierre Toussain some few months later to Œcolampadius,¹ "but certainly Lefèvre has not a particle of courage. May God confirm and strengthen him ! Let them be as wise as they please, let them wait, procrastinate, and disseminate ; the Gospel will never be preached without the Cross ! When I see these things, when I see the mind of the King, the mind of the Duchess (Margaret of Angoulême), as favorable as possible to the advancement of the Gospel of Christ, and those who ought to forward this matter, according to the grace given them, obstructing their design, I cannot refrain from tears. They say, indeed : ' It is not yet time, the hour has not come ! ' And yet we have here no day or hour. What would not you do had you the Emperor and Ferdinand favoring your attempts ? Entreat God, there-

¹ Herminjard, i., p. 447 ; Pierre Toussain to Œcolampadius, Malherbes (July 26, 1526). Trans. after Baird, i., p. 86.

fore, in behalf of France, that she may at length be worthy of His word."

And now the name of Jacques Lefèvre, long the guiding light of the French reformers, disappears from the history of the Reformation. The Sorbonne condemned his works and although Francis, from his prison at Madrid, wrote them, on the 12th of November, 1525, to cease all proceedings against this man "of great and good renown," the Sorbonne refused to obey the captive monarch's order.¹

In 1526, when Francis had regained his liberty—by that famous oath to surrender Burgundy, an oath to which he coupled the mental reservation to break it upon the first favorable opportunity,—he recalled Lefèvre, appointed him tutor to the Dauphin, and later, upon Margaret's intercession, made him royal librarian at the Castle of Blois. But the aged scholar was still too near Paris to be free from the attacks of his enemies, and Margaret, having become Queen of Navarre, obtained her brother's permission to have Lefèvre accompany her to her Gascogne kingdom, where he passed quietly the few remaining years of his life,² not, however, being free from remorse

¹ Haag, *La France Protestante* (after Baird, p. 93 and note).

² He died at Nerac in 1536.

and sorrow at the thought that, through his want of courage in behalf of the Gospel, he had failed to win the glory of a "martyr's crown."¹

The year 1534—the "Year of the Placards," as it is called—marks an epoch in the history of the French Reformation, and it is curious to note that, even at this late date, there were some, and they, too, sincere partisans of their respective causes, who thought that the reformers and the papal Church, in spite of their widely dissimilar and conflicting opinions, might still be reconciled.

It was with this idea in view that Guillaume du Bellay, the noted French diplomatist, began a correspondence, on behalf of the French Court, with Philip Melanchthon. As a result of this negotiation, Melanchthon drew up a document—as remarkable for its charity as for its great concessions—which he thought suitable to serve as the basis of a general agreement. Du Bellay sent it to King Francis, and it seems to have been favorably received by that monarch, but a series of unlooked-for events were soon to destroy all the hopes of

¹ Lefèvre's remorse discussed and confirmed, Baird, p. 96, and note.

reconciliation that optimists had begun to cherish.

On the morning of the 18th of October, 1534, there appeared upon the walls in different parts of Paris, placards which, under the heading, "True Articles respecting the Horrible, Great, and Insupportable Abuses of the Papal Mass," most boldly and violently attacked the papal system. These placards had been prepared by some of the more ardent and less clear-headed reformers,¹ and, having been printed in the establishment of Pierre Van Wingle² at Serrieres near Neufchatel, had been brought secretly to Paris by one Feret, an apprentice of the King's apothecary. The more prudent among the Lutherans at Paris opposed the publication of such a violent document, but their wise counsels did not prevail over the rashness of their brethren, and on October 18th the placard appeared.

"I invoke heaven and earth in testimony of the truth," thus it began, "against that proud

¹ Mr. Baird (p. 164, note) says regarding the authorship of the placard: "Merle d'Aubigné, on the authority of the hostile Florimond de Ræmond, ascribes it to Farel. But the style and mode are quite in contrast with those of Farel. Author of *Petit Traicté de l'Eucharistie* (probably Marcourt) avows authorship of the placard."

² *Bulletin*, ix., pp. 27, 28; after Baird, p. 164, note.

and pompous papal mass, through which (if God remedy not speedily the evil) the world will be wholly desolated, destroyed, and ruined. For therein is our Lord so outrageously blasphemed and the people so blinded and seduced, that it ought no longer to be suffered or endured. The world has long been, and now is, flooded with wretched sacrificing priests, who yet proclaim themselves liars, inasmuch as they chant every Sunday in their vespers, that Christ is a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec. Wherefore not only every man of sound understanding, but they themselves, in spite of themselves, must admit that the Pope and all his brood of cardinals, bishops, monks, and canting mass-priests, with all who consent thereunto, are false prophets, damnable deceivers, apostates, wolves, false shepherds, idolaters, liars, and execrable blasphemers, murderers of souls, renouncers of Jesus Christ, of his death and passion, false witnesses, traitors, thieves, and robbers of the honor of God, and more detestable than devils.”¹

¹ “This singular placard is given *in extenso* by Gerdesius, *Hist. Evan. Renov.*, iv. (Doc.), pp. 60-67; Haag, *France Prot.*, x.; *Pièces Justif.*, pp. 1-6.”—Baird, *Rise of the Huguenots*, p. 167, note.

The effect of such violent and unlimited denunciation of things and men long considered holy can well be imagined, and the common people of Paris, who were wont to regard the service of the Mass with sincere devotion, were naturally roused to fury. But the audacity of the rash reformers reached its culmination when they fastened a copy of this inflammatory placard upon the very door of the royal bedchamber in the palace of Amboise. Francis, not unnaturally, regarded this act as a personal insult, and came at once to Paris to direct in person a search for the offenders. On the 13th of January, 1535, he was induced, through the influence of the Sorbonne,¹ to send to Parliament an edict, "absolutely prohibiting, on pain of the halter, any exercise of the Art of Printing in France,"—a strange edict for a prince who was ambitious to figure as a "modern Mæcenas," and one which, six weeks later, he had sense enough to recall.

And now there was to be an end of clemency toward the reformed faith. It was time to prove to France and papal Europe that the

¹ Didot, *Essai sur la Typographie*, xxvi., 760 (after Baird, p. 169, note).

House of Valois would no longer tolerate the "new doctrines" which had dared thus to insult the monarch in his palace, and Francis, in his anger, refused to listen to Margaret's remonstrances¹ and ordered a diligent search for the authors and publishers of the placards and their arrest, trial, and execution when found,—orders that the Paris Parliament were not slow to carry out. Under the control of the profligate Morin, *Lieutenant-criminel*, and his informers (*les Guainiers*,² they were called), who, induced by hope of reward or fear of punishment, gave information regarding the names and dwelling-places of suspected Lutherans, the work went rapidly on. All reputed heretics were arrested and, as speedily as possible, sent before a tribunal, where the innocent were often made to suffer with the guilty and where the verdict was more frequently "death" than "pardon." Barthélemi Milon, in whose possession one of the damning placards had been found, was given to the

¹ "The Queen of Navarre attempted to moderate his anger by suggesting that it was not unlikely that the placard, far from being composed by the 'Lutherans,' was the cunning device of their enemies, who thus sought their ruin."—Baird, p. 168.

² "I. e., *gainier*, sheath or scabbard-maker. *Hist. Ecclésiastique*, i., p. 10; *Journal d'un Bourgeois*, p. 444."—Baird, p. 171, note.

flames, and Jean du Bourg, who had posted one, having made his *amende honorable* with lighted taper before the church of Notre Dame, had his right hand cut off, at the Fontaine des Innocents, for his "high treason against God and King."

But a more imposing *amende honorable* than that of poor Jean du Bourg was deemed necessary to efface the enormity of so great a crime. Therefore, Thursday, the 21st of January, 1535, was fixed as the day when the King, the Court, and the papal clergy should carry the holy relics of the Romish Church, and above all the sacred Eucharist, in solemn procession, to the doors of Notre Dame. On that day the good citizens of Paris were astir at an early hour ; the streets along the line of march had all been newly swept ; the windows in the houses of the nobles and the wealthy *bourgeois* were gay with many-colored tapestries ; over all doors the waxen tapers burned ; and the men, who with their halberds lined the thoroughfare, kept in order the crowd of citizens in holiday attire.

Slowly through the Rue Saint Denis and Rue Saint-Honoré and across the Bridge of

Notre Dame came the splendid procession.¹ First marched the men-at-arms and then Queen Eleonore, surrounded by her maids of honor, whose crimson satin dresses formed a brilliant contrast to her sombre velvet robes. After them the monastic orders with their burning tapers,—the Franciscans, Augustinians, Dominicans, and Carmelites,—the clergy of the parish churches, the chapter of the cathedral, the professors and scholars of the Paris University, the Swiss guards with their halberds, the musicians, trumpeters, and hautboys; then followed the priests of “*Sainte Chapelle*,” bearing in their costly reliquaries the holy relics of the Romish Church,—the crown of thorns, the holy lance, the purple robe, the great crown of St. Louis,—and then the cardinals, Givri, Tournon, Le Veneur, and Chatillon, in their robes of office. Under a splendid velvet canopy, the supports of which were held by the Dauphin and the Ducs d’Orléans, d’Angoulême, and Bourbon Vendôme, walked Jean du Bellay, Bishop of Paris, carrying that object of universal adoration, the great silver cross containing the consecrated wafer of the Eucharist. King

¹ Description of the great expiatory procession condensed from Baird, pp. 173-176, vol. i.

Francis surrounded by his officers closed the procession, and as this prince, having handed his taper to the Cardinal of Lorraine, knelt down in his black velvet robes at the various stations erected along the route and "worshipped with joined hands" while the grand anthem in honor of the sacrament was being sung, "there was no one among the people," so say the registers of the Hotel de Ville, "be he small or great, that did not shed warm tears and pray God in behalf of the King, whom he beheld performing so devout an act and worthy of long remembrance."¹ So they went, in splendid procession, to the church of Notre Dame, and, after a brilliant mass in the famous old cathedral, there was a great dinner at the episcopal palace where Francis, in a speech to the assembled nobles, cardinals, ambassadors, and judges of the Parliament, declared his intention of no longer tolerating the reformed faith.

"The errors, which have multiplied, and are even now multiplying, are but of our own days," he said. "Our fathers have shown us how to live in accordance with the word of God and of our Mother, Holy Church. In that Church I

¹ *Registres de l'Hôtel de Ville*, Félibien, *Pièces Justif.*, v., 315 (after Baird, p. 176, note).

am resolved to live and die, and I am determined to prove that I am entitled to be called Very Christian. I notify you that it is my will that these errors be driven from my kingdom. Nor shall I excuse any from the task. Were one of my arms infected with this poison, I should cut it off ! Were my own children contaminated, I should immolate them !”¹ He made good his word, and to such an extent were the Lutherans punished during the next few months,² by execution, by torture, by the *estrapade*³ (where the condemned were alternately raised and lowered over a blazing fire), by all manner of torture-producing devices, that even the Roman Pontiff, Paul III., if we may believe the evidence of a contemporary,⁴ wrote to Francis requesting him to moderate his severity and declaring that he had indeed

¹ “ En sorte que si un des bras de mon corps estoit infecté de cette farine, je le voudrois couper ; et si mes enfans en estoient entachez, je les voudrois immoler.” The contemporary *Cronique du Roy Francois Ier*, giving the fullest version of the speech (pp. 121-126), attributed to the King about the same expressions.—Baird, p. 176.

² January-June, 1535.

³ “ Une espèce d'estrapade ou l'on attachoit les criminels, que les bourreaux, par le moyen d'une corde, guindoient en haut, et les laissoient ensuite tomber dans le feu à diverses reprises, pour faire durer leur supplice plus long tems.”—Félibien (after Baird, p. 178).

⁴ *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris*, 458, 459 (after Baird, p. 180, note).

made good his claim to the titles of the Eldest Son of the Church and *Le Roi Très Chrétien*.

And now the French reformers, threatened with the gallows or the stake or driven into banishment, could no longer look to Paris and the Court for encouragement, but were constrained to turn their eyes toward the Alps, and, from this period, the centre of the reformatory activity is to be found, not in the great capital of France, but with Calvin at Geneva.

Many were the persecutions which the French Huguenots were still to undergo—from Henry II., from Francis II., and, worst of all, from Charles IX. and his Medicæan mother, when, at their command, the tocsin of Saint Germain l'Auxerrois sounded the signal for the St. Bartholomew—before they received, in 1598, their famous Edict of Nantes, which partially protected them until the day when the Grand Monarch and the Maintenon drove them forth,¹ to carry their wealth, their industry, and their God-fearing devotion into other lands and thus inflicted upon the prosperity of France the most terrible blow it had ever received.²

¹ Louis XIV. revoked the Edict of Nantes, October 18, 1685.

² One year after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Marshal Vauban wrote: "France has lost one hundred thousand inhabitants,

Can it be said that if Luther and Zwingli had never appeared there would still have been a reforming movement in France? It is possible; but, to go into the realm of mere speculation, it is probable that the extent and force of that movement would have been very limited. The ideas of the Reformation "were not, in France, a foreign importation"¹; they sprang up on French soil, but the men to whom it was given to spread the truth abroad differed much from the sturdy heroes who, in Germany, carried on the cause to victory. Briçonnet, who might have done so much, did so little; Farel—whose work in Switzerland it has not come within the limits of this paper to study—approached Luther more nearly than any other of the French reformers, but, though he possessed much of Luther's boldness, he lacked much of his wisdom, his judgment, and his genius; Lefèvre, to whom the light came so early, was not the man to bear the brunt of battle.

"Some place Lefèvre among the Protestants," says Henri Graf, "while others seek to

sixty millions of coined money, nine thousand sailors, twelve thousand soldiers, six hundred officers, and her most flourishing manufactures."

¹ D'Aubigné, p. 347.

cleanse him from that stain of heresy and prove that he was to the end a good Catholic. It seems that this question cannot remain doubtful when we read his *Commentary upon the New Testament* and the epistle which precedes his translation of the Gospels. He recognized no other source of true Christianity than the Bible, and he desired to free religion from all human traditions. He hoped for salvation only from the grace of God through Jesus Christ, and he attached no merit to mere works and the acts commanded by the Church. If he did not declare himself a member of the Protestant Church, it was because there was then no Protestant Church in France, and he was not the man designed by Providence to found it. His character was not sufficiently enterprising, nor his spirit sufficiently bold, to enable him to place himself at the head of the movement, and, at the period when it started, he was much too old to be able to engage in a conflict against a Church which had such terrible means of defence.”¹

The soil, in France, was well prepared ; the new ideas were expanding in men's minds, but there was needed a man of genius, a “ gigantic

¹ Graf, *Essai*, etc., pp. 126, 127.

personality," to give the vital impetus. He came ; and, as von Polenz has expressed it, "The trumpet-blast which Luther, in the year 1517, sounded, in Germany, awakened all spirits in France."¹

¹ Von Polenz, *Geschichte des französischen Calvinismus*, p. 167.

THE CLUB OF THE JACOBINS.

AUTHORITIES CONSULTED.

F. A. Aulard, *La Société des Jacobins. Collection de Documents Relatifs à l'Histoire de Paris Pendant la Révolution Française.* Publiée sous le patronage du Conseil Municipal, Paris, 1889-1891.

Biographie Générale, Paris, 1857 ; articles: Bailly, Barère, Billaud-Varenne, David, Collot d'Herbois, Danton, Robespierre, Rabaut Saint-Étienne, Réal, Mirabeau, Barnave, Cloots, etc.

Bourrienne, *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte.*

Buchez and Roux, *Histoire Parlementaire de la Révolution Française.*

Carlyle, *The French Revolution.*

Dispatches of Earl Gower (1790-1792). Edited by Oscar Browning.

J. Gros, *Le Comité de Salut Public.* Paris, 1893.

D'Hericault, *La Révolution de Thermidor.* Paris, 1878.

Mémoires : de l'Abbé Grégoire ; de Madame Campan ; de Madame de Rémusat ; de Chancelier Pasquier ; de la Duchesse de Tourzel.

Le Moniteur Universel. Réimpression de l'Ancien Moniteur avec des Notes Explicatives par M. Leonard Gallois. Paris, 1840.

Montgaillard, *Histoire de France.* Paris, 1828.

Mortimer-Ternaux, *Histoire de la Terreur, d'après des Documents Authentiques et Inédits.* Paris, 1870.

Prudhomme, *Révolutions de Paris.* Paris, 1789-1793.

A. Schmidt, *Tableaux de la Révolution Française.*

Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française.* Paris, 1893.

H. Morse Stephens, *History of the French Revolution.*

Taine, *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine. La Révolution.*

THE CLUB OF THE JACOBINS.

WHEN, on the 5th of May, 1789, the States-General of France was solemnly opened at Versailles, there were some among the more far-sighted in that great assembly who had a presentiment that, in spite of the pomp with which the King and Court were surrounded, the old order of things was passing away.¹ A sense of change was in the air. This day, so long and ardently expected, seemed to many the consummation of their wishes, to some, the beginning of unknown dangers. The common people were filled with the hope that now at last there was to be some amelioration of their hard lot,—that now at last the good time was coming when, as King Henry IV. had said, “every peasant should have his fowl in the pot”; the patriots were filled with the idea of regenerating France, of seeing the old abuses

¹ *Memoirs of Chancellor Pasquier*, i., p. 44.

swept away while they themselves assisted in the work amid popular applause ; the disaffected were secretly cherishing hopes and plans of self-aggrandizement ; the nobility were stoutly resolved to maintain their prerogatives ; royalty was uncertain what course to pursue, and was full of misgiving not unmingled with alarm.¹

The early days of May, 1789, which thus saw the opening of this memorable assembly—the first States-General since the time of Richelieu,—saw also the formation of that famous organization, destined ere long to rise above the wrecks of the Old Régime and become, for a time, the chief power in France—the Jacobin Club. We find the origin of this famous society, the Paris Club of the Jacobins, in the Breton Club of Versailles.

The Deputies to the States-General from Bretagne, few of whom had ever been to Paris or Versailles before, for travelling at that time was not the simple matter it is to-day, felt the need of standing and acting together. They were going into the midst of a great assembly collected from all parts of France ; into the presence of their King whom they had probably never seen, and of whom they stood in

¹ Madame Campan, *Mémoires de Marie Antoinette*, p. 218.

considerable awe, and they saw that, if they were to accomplish anything in behalf of the people by whom they had been elected, they must have union among themselves.

They held several meetings therefore before setting out, and decided that, upon arriving at Versailles, they would secure a suitable place where they could meet regularly and discuss their plans. Nicholas Amaury, the lemonade-seller of Versailles, a man of property and of considerable influence, was well known for his liberal opinions, and his café, called the Café Amaury, was generally recommended to the deputies who arrived from different parts of the kingdom. Located on the Rue de la Pompe, No. 44, at the corner of the Avenue of Saint Cloud, the Café Amaury had the great advantage, in addition to the fact that it was one of the best in Versailles at that period, of being but a short distance from the great hall of the Hôtel de Menus where the States-General sat.

The Café Amaury seemed then to the Deputies from Bretagne a most suitable place in which to hold their meetings, and they accordingly established themselves there, taking the name of the Breton Club. They numbered at first but seventy-four persons in all, twenty-

eight of whom were members of the Clergy and forty-six of whom were members of the Third Estate. The nobility were not represented, for the nobles of Bretagne had refused to send delegates to the States-General. Almost immediately, however, the Bretons received most notable additions, for they admitted to their membership the Duc d'Aiguillon, Mirabeau, Sieyès, Barnave, Pétion, Volney, the Abbé Grégoire, Charles and Alexander Lameth, Robespierre, La Revéllière-Lepeaux, and the Marquis de Lacoste.

By the 23d of June—the day of the famous *séance royale*—their number had increased to one hundred and fifty. In the Café Amaury, Mirabeau began to develop that plan of revolution which he was later to carry out. He worked with caution, however, and, according to Montjoie,¹ the only ones at first initiated into his secret were La Chapelier, Sieyès, Barnave, Pétion, and Volney.

The Breton Club² soon became a centre for the more radical spirits, and in its little gather-

¹ Montjoie, *Histoire de la Révolution de France*, p. 121 (after Aulard).

² All statements regarding the meeting-place of the Breton Club and the number of its members are upon the authority of M. Aulard, tome i., pp. 1-40.

ings revolutionary ideas advanced rapidly. By the middle of July they had already resolved on desperate measures. M. Corroller (*Procureur du Roi* at Hennebont), breakfasting with MM. Malouet and Dufraisse, informed them that "it had been resolved in the Breton Club, if the Court did not dismiss Necker, that, in order to stir up the people, the Palais-Bourbon should be set on fire." Necker, however, was dismissed and the insurrection of the 14th of July and the fall of the Bastille followed, much to the joy of the Breton Club, who, to quote Montjoie, "rejoiced to see that the dismissal of M. Necker had at last begun the Revolution." They then decided to place the Duc d'Orléans at the head of affairs that, as Mirabeau said, "the ship of state might advance more rapidly towards liberty."

When, as the result of the insurrection of the 6th of October, the royal family were carried off to Paris by the women of the capital, the National Assembly declared themselves inseparable from the person of the King and followed him, and as the Breton Club was composed entirely of members of the National Assembly, there was consequently no longer any Breton Club at Versailles.

Where the Bretons met, if they met at all, from the early days of October when they arrived in Paris until near the close of the year when they established themselves in the Jacobin Convent, Rue Saint-Honoré, is a matter of doubt. Montjoie says that they met, for a time, at No. 7, Place des Victoires, but no other authority confirms his statement. Alexander de Lameth, in his *L'Histoire de l'Assemblée Constituante*, tells us, and it seems likely enough, that upon their first arrival the majority of the deputies, finding themselves in Paris for the first time, were somewhat lost, so to speak, in that great city, and busied themselves in getting lodgings as near as they could to the National Assembly, which had taken as its place of meeting the riding-school of the Tuileries which then faced the Tuileries' garden on the side of the present Rue de Rivoli. Once settled in Paris the members of the Breton Club began to look about for a suitable hall in which to continue their meetings, and finally, near the close of 1789, they secured the Convent of the Jacobin Friars on the Rue Saint-Honoré, and there installed themselves under the name of "Society of the Friends of the Constitution Meeting at the Jacobins in

Paris." Their enemies nicknamed them "The Jacobins," and as such they are known to history.

The Society occupied successively, in the interior of the Jacobin Convent, three different locations. For the first few weeks of its existence, a small apartment on the ground-floor (rented at the rate of two hundred francs a year), then from the early days of 1790 to the 29th of May, 1791, the library of the Convent, and, finally, from the 29th of May, 1791, to the end of its existence (November 11, 1794), the chapel. The small apartment on the ground-floor was occupied so short a time, and only during organization, that the regular meetings of the Club may be said to commence with their occupation of the library. This library of the Jacobins, as pictures of the time still show it, was a long apartment with heavy arched ceiling and windows. Over the principal entrance-door a large painting, attributed to Nicholas de Lestain, represented Saint Thomas Aquinas and the different monastic orders. In the centre of the hall, to the right of the door of entrance, were placed the table and arm-chair of the president of the Club, raised two steps above the floor, and

below them the table for the secretaries, while directly opposite, facing the president's chair, was the tribune from which the members addressed the Society. Eight rows of benches extended the length of the apartment, four on each side, and upon these the members sat.

The objects and purposes for which the Society met are clearly set forth in the regulations for their internal organization, which, having been drawn up by Barnave, were adopted by the Society on the 8th of February, 1790.¹ These objects were primarily three in number: 1st, to discuss in advance all questions that were to be decided in the National Assembly; 2d, to labor for the establishment and support of the Constitution; 3d, to correspond with the other societies of the same class (*sociétés affiliées*) that were to be formed in the kingdom. The admission of persons desiring to join the Society was voted upon orally and not by ballot. It was necessary that five members of the Club should propose their names, unless they chanced to be members of the National Assembly, in which case two members were sufficient. Their names were then posted during two meetings,

¹ F. A. Aulard, *La Société des Jacobins* (organisation intérieure).

upon a card prepared for that purpose, together with the names of the members who proposed them and those who approved them. During this time any one could make objections to them, and finally their admission was decided by an oral vote. Persons living out of Paris were admitted as non-resident members, and other clubs of the same nature that were formed throughout France were, upon the demand of some of their members, admitted as affiliated societies, provided that the persons who made the proposition guaranteed that their spirit was in harmony with that of the Mother Society, and with these affiliated societies the Jacobins entered at once into active correspondence.

The officers of the Society consisted of a president, four secretaries, and a treasurer. There was no vice-president, and in the absence of the president his place was filled by the last of his predecessors who happened to be present. The president and two of the secretaries were elected every month by ballot, and the treasurer could be displaced at will. The Club met regularly at six o'clock in the evening on all days not entirely occupied by the National Assembly, with the exception of

Sundays and fête-days. In their order of debate they followed the rules governing the National Assembly. The initiation fee was fixed at twelve livres and the annual dues at twenty-four livres, payable on the first days of January, April, July, and October.

The meetings of the Society, while they continued in the library, were not open to the public, but when they moved into the chapel in May, 1791, the tribune of the choir was reserved for ladies, and in October of the same year the general public were admitted. On the 21st of December, 1790, the Jacobins numbered 1102 members, and a year later their membership had increased to 1211.

Among their supporters were found lawyers, philosophers, members of the French Academy, men of the robe, *ci-devant* nobles, *bourgeois*, and *sansculottes*. There was the Duc d'Aiguillon, of the old Duplessis-Richelieu family, who, though his father had been Minister of Foreign Affairs under Louis XV., embraced eagerly the cause of the Revolution; likewise Bailly, the mathematician and member of the French Academy, he who, as Mayor of Paris, addressed King Louis at the barriers, on that July morning, 1789, when his Majesty

was brought to Paris to grace the triumph of the Bastille conquerors,—“Sire, Henry IV. had conquered his people, and here it is the people who have reconquered their King!”; and Barère, the young lawyer of Tarbes, who was to be President of the Convention and Member of the Committee of Public Safety, and, in September, 1793, to request of the Convention that “*La Terreur* be the order of the day”¹; and Barnave, the enthusiastic young *avocat* from Grenoble, who loved the Revolution but abhorred its crimes; and Beauharnais, the Viscount from Martinique, who died upon the scaffold, and whose widow was to join her lot to the fortunes of the young General Bonaparte and become world-famous as the Empress Josephine; and Billaud-Varenne, the *avocat* from Rochelle, one of the most violent and blood-thirsty of all the revolutionary leaders; and Brune, the journalist, the future conqueror of Belgium and Marshal of the Empire; and Cloots, who styled himself “Anacharsis,” and, not content with attacking kings, attacked God himself, calling him “l’en-

¹ “*Plaçons la terreur à l’ordre du jour.*” The words were first used by a deputation from the Jacobin Club. Barère quoted them and the Convention did not decree them (as commonly thought). See *Moniteur*, No. 250, vol. xvii., p. 526.

nemi personnel" ; and Collot d' Herbois, the actor of the Rue du Mail, a worthy colleague of Billaud-Varenne ; and the Abbé Grégoire, who wrote his *Mémoires*, and, among other works, the *Histoire des Confesseurs des Empereurs et des Rois* ; and Charles and Alexander, the brothers Lameth,¹ who fought bravely under Rochambeau in America, one being wounded at Yorktown ; and Lavalette, who fought at the Tuileries on August 10th, who became a Count of the Empire and had strange adventures during the " Hundred Days " ; and Legendre, the Paris butcher, who headed the " Necker-d'Orléans bust procession " on the 13th of July, 1789, and led the attack on the Bastille the day following ; and Mirabeau, the " son of thunder," the greatest orator in revolutionary France ; and Pétion, the Mayor of Paris ; and Desmoulins, the editor of the *Vieux Cordelier*, and friend of Danton ; and the young Duc de Chartres—Louis Philippe d'Orléans—who, after innumerable adventures, was one day to become King

¹ The character of the Jacobin Club changed greatly after 1791, and men like the Lameths, Bailly, Barnave, and all the more moderate members entirely disapproved the violent actions of the Mountain party. It is too often supposed that the Jacobin Club was composed of only the most violent republicans. Such was not the case.

of the French under the title of Louis Philippe the First ; and Rabaut Saint-Étienne, the *Constituant* of Nîmes, who wrote an *Almanach Historique de la Révolution Française* ; and David, the great painter, who, after participating in all the crimes of Robespierre and Collot d'Herbois, was to turn imperialist, and portray upon canvas, in his "Coronation of Josephine," the triumphs of the Age Napoléon ; and Réal the constant orator of the Jacobins, the future public accuser and Count of the Empire, who was to play a part in the Duc d'Enghien business at Vincennes in 1804 ; and Robespierre, the "incorruptible" Maximilien, too well known to need comment, and his brother, Robespierre the younger, who died with him on the scaffold ; and Tallien, the hero of the "Ninth Thermidor," who lived to see himself forgotten ; and Talma, the great actor of the Comédie Française, who was to teach Napoleon how to wear his robes of state ; and Carle Vernet, whose paintings adorn the Louvre and Luxembourg ; and, finally, Philippe-Joseph, Duc d'Orléans (Égalité), Prince of the Blood, and the fourth personage in the kingdom.

Such were some of the more prominent

members who composed the Jacobin Society, and thus, from its foundation, with its many great names and high prestige, the Paris Club enjoyed an exceptional position, and one which it soon strengthened immensely by establishing its branch societies (*sociétés affiliées*) throughout France. By the summer of 1790, these branch societies numbered one hundred and fifty-two; in May, 1791, they had increased to four hundred and six; and in the spring of 1794, the time of the greatest Jacobin influence, their number was somewhat over one thousand.¹

This completeness of party organization—none of their opponents had anything that could compare to it—is a most noticeable feature in the history of the Jacobins. By means of it they attained to supreme power, and it is all the more noteworthy as being the first modern example of what organization in politics can accomplish.

At the beginning of 1791, the revolutionary movement, begun by the States-General in 1789, was losing force, for the Revolution seemed to have accomplished all that its most

¹ There are many statements as to the number of Jacobin Clubs in the Year Two. The figures given above are on the authority of M. Aulard, tome i., pp. 80-89.

ardent supporters had primarily hoped it might attain. The Old Régime, with its despotism, privileged *noblesse*, feudal laws, and antiquated system of taxation, had disappeared, and freedom had been established in politics, in industry, and in trade. The men of law and order, the patriots of 1789, at the head of whom were Lafayette, Mirabeau,¹ Barnave,¹ and the Lameths,¹ saw that the time had come to stop, and men in general, after the stormy excitements of the past two years, had begun to long for a period of rest. They were anxious to be busy again about their private affairs, for politics, with the many duties and burdens imposed by the Constitution, had become laborious.

But there was a dissatisfied minority to whom the Revolution seemed to have brought little. They had fondly imagined that by revolution they were to get everything, and not having attained the summit of their desires, they were not willing that any one should talk of the Revolution as "accomplished," as some of the Assembly leaders were beginning to do.

Many people were out of employment, and

¹ Though they were Jacobins they disapproved of the violent course taken by the more radical members of their party. There were Jacobins and Jacobins. Not all were extreme revolutionists.

in Paris the difficulty had been especially increased by the number of those who flocked there from the provinces. In nearly all trades that minister to luxury and refinement there was stagnation, and carriage-builders, wig-makers, perfumers, and all the dealers in the thousand and one costly fabrics which then formed so large a part of the trade of Paris, were crying out loudly at the general depression.

The improvement in trade, stimulated by the issue of assignats, had been only temporary, and the common people who, owing to the scarcity of grain, were again experiencing the pangs of hunger, felt that they were still a long way off from Henry IV.'s millennium of "the chicken in the pot," which they had been so sure the Revolution was to bring. 2 -

The Constitutional party, pledged to support the King and the Constitution, had been busy for the past two years in proclaiming the absolute equality of man and stripping the Crown of its prerogatives, and now in their endeavor to stop and to insist upon the maintenance of the monarchical system, they showed plainly that it was not their intention to admit the poorest class to power.

That class, consequently, began immediately to echo those theories of absolute equality which for the past two years had been so loudly proclaimed. Thus amid all these conflicting passions and theories it was left for the professional politicians, — the Jacobins, — to take advantage of all these circumstances and begin the second revolutionary movement, and from 1791 to 1794 the Revolution becomes, as M. Taine has aptly expressed it, "The Jacobin Conquest."

To meet the wishes of all the dissatisfied ones, and, by removing the causes of their trouble, make of them fairly contented citizens, was a task in which the greatest statesman might well have failed. And the greatest statesman of that day—the only man perhaps who might, by his genius and his popularity, have avoided Scylla and escaped Charybdis in reconciling the Revolution to the Crown, and so made good his promise to the Queen a short time previous in the garden of Saint Cloud, ("Madame, the Monarchy is saved!")¹—had lain down to die.

On the 2d of April, 1791, Mirabeau, worn out by work and sickness, breathed his last.

¹ Madame Campan, *Mémoires de Marie Antoinette*, p. 283.

On the 3d of April, the Jacobins passed the following decree :

“ 1st—The members of the Society shall in a body accompany the funeral procession. 2d—The Society shall wear mourning for eight days. 3d—The anniversary of the death of Mirabeau shall be perpetually a day of mourning for the Friends of the Constitution. 4th—The Society shall order made a marble bust of Mirabeau beneath which shall be engraved these words, which he addressed at the time of the *séance royale* to M. de Brézé, who came to order the members of the National Assembly to separate, ‘Go tell those who sent you that we are here by the will of the people and that we shall not go hence except by the power of the bayonet!’ 5th—This bust shall be placed perpetually in the meeting-hall of the Society of the Friends of the Constitution.”¹

Mirabeau’s day was over ; the morrow was to see the rise of a new apostle of liberty—Maximilien Robespierre.

The elections of 1791 furnish a significant example of the growing power of the Jacobins.

¹ Aulard, tome ii., p. 288, *après le Journal des Amis de la Constitution.*

At each election since 1789 they had gradually crept into power, but now they entered in large numbers. Pétion became Mayor of Paris, Manuel, *procureur-syndic* with Danton as his deputy, and Robespierre, *procureur-du-roi*.

One hundred and thirty-six of the new deputies to the National Assembly entered their names on the Jacobin Club register within the first week after their arrival, thus swelling the number of deputies among its members to two hundred and fifty. The Abbé Grégoire, in his *Mémoires*, has left us an interesting description of the manner in which the Jacobins influenced the action of the Assembly. "Our tactics," he says, "were very simple. It was understood that one of us should take advantage of the first favorable opportunity to propose some measure in the National Assembly that was sure to be applauded by a small minority and cried down by the majority, but that made no difference. The proposer demanded, which was granted, that the measure should be referred to a committee in which its opponents hoped to see it buried. Then the Paris Jacobins took hold of it. A circular was issued, after which an article on the measure was printed in their journal and discussed in

three or four hundred clubs that were leagued together. Three weeks after this, the Assembly was flooded with petitions from every quarter demanding a decree, of which the first proposal had been rejected and which it now passed by a great majority because a discussion of it had ripened public opinion."¹ Such was the working of the Jacobin political machine.

The death of Mirabeau had put an end to the hope of firmly establishing the Monarchy in its Constitutional form, and, though the Queen and the Court party were not sorry to be freed from one whom they both feared and distrusted, Louis XVI. seemed to have realized the greatness of the statesman he had lost. "Do not rejoice over the death of Mirabeau," he said to the Queen, "we have suffered a greater loss than you imagine."² There is no more pitiable figure in the great drama of the Revolution than King Louis XVI. himself. He was a thoroughly good and honest man; he sincerely desired the welfare of his people, but the great weakness of his character made it impossible for him either to enforce measures that his better sense told

¹ *Mémoires de l'Abbé Grégoire*, tome i., p. 387.

² *Mémoires de la Duchesse de Tourzel*, edited by the Duc des Cars, Paris, 1883, tome i., p. 247.

him were wise and prudent, or to refrain from following advice, forced upon him, which he was often equally sure was harmful to his best interests. In important affairs of state, although amid various counsels he often knew which was best, he never had the resolution to say, "I prefer the opinion of such a one."¹ Minus his blue ribbon and his star of the Order of the Holy Ghost he appeared, as he in truth was, a fat, honest *bourgeois*,—the good father of a family. He would have made a capital locksmith, for his greatest delight was to go up into his forge at the top of the palace of Versailles, take off his coat, and file away at his locks with the *sieur Gamain*, and the specimens of his handiwork, which the curious may see to-day in the *Musée des Souveraines* at Paris, prove that he was no indifferent workman.²

Fate played him a sorry trick in placing him upon a throne and his crown which he had said "hurt him" (*Elle me gene!*) when they crowned him in the grand old cathedral at Rheims, he was destined to find "hurtful" in every sense.

¹ *Mémoires de Soulavie* (after Madame Campan).

² See article, "Le Roi Artisan," par M. Henri Bouchot, in *L'Art et Lettres*, 1889.

His badly planned and worse-executed flight in June, 1791, which ended in his arrest at Varennes and ignominious return to Paris, destroyed almost entirely the personal respect which he had hitherto inspired and, by causing him to be generally distrusted, sealed his fate. This event, which greatly increased the difficulties of the moderate party who desired to keep Louis on his throne, furnished a weapon to the Jacobins which they were not slow to use, but in the method to be followed the party was divided. Danton and Desmoulins at the Cordelier Club loudly demanded a republic; Marat wanted a dictator who should put all enemies to death, while the adherents of the Duc d'Orléans desired the King's downfall that they might have Philippe Égalité set up in his place.

The Jacobin Club as a whole, however, were not ready for such extreme measures. At the meeting of July 1, 1791, Billaud-Varenne attempted to speak in favor of a republic. "To-day," said he, "when the throne has been almost overturned by the flight of the King, I am still more surprised that means have not been taken to demolish it. I now propose to discuss this question, Which will

suit us the better—a monarchy or a republic?”¹ Here, interrupted by hisses and loud shouts, he was not allowed to continue, for the Jacobins, though they demanded Louis’s deposition, still hesitated to approve the abolition of the throne.

At the meeting of July 11th, M. Carra, having discussed the inviolability of the King, concluded by proposing that “Louis XVI. be deposed and his son be elected to the throne and that a council of regency be appointed,”² and, at the same meeting, M. Chenaux discussed, at great length, the following question, “What ought the legislators to do in the circumstances in which they find themselves?” In the course of his speech he said: “What ought we to do? Is it necessary to change our Constitution and pass from a monarchy to a republic? I do not think so. Is it necessary to punish the King as an individual and compel him to undergo the burden and rigor of a trial? I do not adopt that opinion. I desire that we shall not waver for an instant, that we shall not deviate in the least degree from our Constitution. We have decreed that

¹ Aulard, tome ii., p. 574.

² *Ibid.*, tome iii., p. 2.

the person of the King was inviolable. I desire to give that decree the widest interpretation. I am not ignorant of the thousand and one reasons that present themselves to explain and comment upon it, but I do not wish to stop there ; I fear that we make assumptions, that we determine too much by circumstances. Without doubt Louis XVI. has committed an atrocious crime, but he was King, and it is very rarely that virtue goes to dwell in the palace of kings in order to punish them for not having known her. Let the National Assembly, by the same power by which it has formerly made Louis XVI. the first of men, now cover him with the ignominy due the weakest and most traitorous and declare authentically his incapacity to bear the honorable sceptre of the first king of liberty ; let it place that sceptre in the hands of his son, the hope of the French, and let it not fear contradiction. . . . Give to Louis XVI. the right to retire under a good and sure guard into whatever place he may wish to make his residence, always within the limits of the kingdom ; prohibit him from interfering with the exercise of the executive power, and order that an action be commenced and carried out against all those

who, by advice or personal aid, were the abettors of his escape."¹

On the 13th of July, Danton cried out at the Jacobins: "Kings have never treated in good faith with peoples who wished to recover their liberty. Let the National Assembly tremble; the nation, regenerated by liberty, has become a Hercules who will crush the serpents which seek to devour it. It will achieve its twelve labors in exterminating all its enemies!"²

Finally, on Friday, the 15th of July, the Assembly refused to take any action tending to bring the King to trial, and on Saturday, the 16th, the Constitutional-Royalist party triumphed, and, on the motion of M. Desmeuniers, secured the passage of a decree by which the Assembly declared that, "The effect of the decree of the 25th of June, which suspended the execution of the royal functions and the executive power in the hands of the King, should remain in force until the Constitution should be presented to the King and accepted by him."³ This action, which showed plainly that the Assembly intended to keep Louis on

¹ Aulard, tome iii., pp. 3-10.

² Ibid., p. 13 (note).

³ Buchez et Roux, *Histoire Parlementaire*, etc., tome xi., p. 97.

his throne, aroused determined opposition among the more radical republicans, and they planned a great demonstration to take place on Sunday, the 17th of July, at the Champ-de-Mars, when the people of Paris should sign a petition demanding the King's deposition. By this means they hoped to force the Assembly to carry out their wishes. The demonstration took place and the signing of the petition went on quietly enough until the crowd discovered two men who had concealed themselves under the great altar which had been erected in the centre of the place. Some one cried out that they had gunpowder and intended to blow up the altar and all the people who were on it. They were dragged out at once and, not being able to satisfactorily explain their presence, their heads were cut off and paraded about on pikes amid great excitement. When the news of this outrage reached the Hôtel-de-Ville the Municipality ordered the proclamation of martial law, and, about half-past seven in the evening, Lafayette and Bailly, Mayor of Paris, with some companies of the National Guard appeared on the Champ-de-Mars to put down the disturbance. Bailly ordered the crowd to disperse, but they simply hooted him, and then

Lafayette ordered his men to fire. About twelve people were killed, and the remainder took to their heels.

On the 18th of July, the day following this affair of the Champ-de-Mars, Lord Gower, then English Ambassador at Paris, wrote as follows to his Government: "The proceedings of the National Assembly on Friday last with regard to the King having occasioned much fermentation, and the next morning a crowd of people assembled around the *Autel de la Patrie* being harangued by deputations from the Club of the Jacobins, who not only spoke of the King and the royal family in the most opprobrious terms, but reviled the Assembly, they gave directions to the ministers, the department, and the municipality to use every possible exertion in order to maintain peace and enforce the laws. Yesterday morning two unfortunate men were discovered concealed under the *Autel de la Patrie*, it is supposed out of a mere frolic, for which they paid dear. It was spread about that they were concealed there with a design to blow up the altar, and summary justice was executed upon them; their heads, being severed from their bodies, were carried on pikes, and the mangled bodies dragged

in a horrid manner along the streets ; a troop of cavalry, to the amount of some hundreds, and infantry arrived time enough to prevent this horrid spectacle from being exhibited in the midst of Paris ; but as soon as they were departed the crowd reassembled in the Champ-de-Mars, and it was judged expedient that M. de Lafayette and the Mayor of Paris should go there with a considerable force and proclaim martial law. Being not only insulted, but pelted with stones, the Guards were at length obliged to fire ; ten or twelve men are said to be killed, about as many wounded, and some are carried to prison. Paris is at present perfectly quiet." On July 22d he wrote again : " As long as the red flag continues to be displayed at the Hôtel-de-Ville, we may expect to feel the effects of that energy which military law has given to Government. A wonderful change has taken place since the disturbances of the 17th compelled the majority of the Assembly to be sensible of its power. It is calculated that two hundred people have been imprisoned since that event, upon suspicion of fomenting sedition by writing or by other means. Danton is fled, and M. Robespierre, the great *Dénonciateur* and, by

office, *Accusateur public*, is about to be *dénoncé* himself." ¹

It is now necessary to see what part the Jacobin Club actually took in this affair of the Champ-de-Mars of which they are commonly supposed to have been the instigators.

Le Babillard of July 18th contains the following account of the events of July 16th, the day before the great demonstration: "At noon, four commissioners from the Jacobins arrived carrying copies of the petition which was to be addressed to the legislative body. It was read: on one side by an Englishman, a small man, with light curly hair; on the other side by a somewhat taller man, with red hair, who wore a red coat. The sieur Danton, mounted on one of the angles of the altar, delivered an animated speech; the crowd, collected around this virtuous tribune, made it impossible for us to hear him." But the most detailed statement concerning the action of the Jacobins on the 16th and 17th of July is that drawn up by the Society itself on July 20, 1791, and which is given by M. Aulard in his collection of the Jacobin documents. ²

¹ *Dispatches of Lord Gower* (1790-1792), pp. 106-108.

² Aulard, tome iii., p. 42.

“The petition,” it says, “was not drawn up in a meeting of the Society of the Friends of the Constitution, because the law declared that petitions were to be made individually and not collectively. The meeting of Friday evening (the 15th) had adjourned, when a number of citizens, not members of the Society, came suddenly into its place of meeting. It was then declared that the meeting they held was not that of the Society but a gathering of citizens acting as individuals, and, having consulted regarding a petition and upon the form of drawing it up, they agreed upon its object and named two persons among them as commissioners to draw it up. The following morning (the 16th) these same citizens met in the Convent of the Jacobins, all doors being open, listened to the reading of the petition, approved it, named commissioners to carry copies to the Champ-de-Mars to the citizens who were to assemble there. They consulted the members of the Society upon this proceeding. The members called their attention to Article 62 of the Municipal Regulations which ordered the Municipality to prevent all gatherings. They named twelve commissioners; their powers were not given in the name of

the Society but in the name of the citizens intending to make the petition, and they were to give notice of the terms of the law when they had assembled about the *Autel de la Patrie*. The *procureur-syndic* of the commune gave to the commissioners the act of this notification. The commissioners arrived on the field of the Federation. There, certain spirits, imbued with pernicious ideas of bad republicanism, had drawn up petitions of which the commissioners knew nothing. Their petition was generally criticised from the fact that it contained the words, 'and to take measures to replace him by all constitutional means.'¹ They were not willing to sign with these limitations. Some took the liberty to add, after the words, 'Louis XVI. for their king,' these words, 'nor any other.' The commissioners were not able to persuade them to make no change, and it was agreed to consult the Society of the Friends of the Constitution upon

¹ The last clause of the petition was as follows: "They demand formally and specially that the National Assembly agree to receive, in the name of the nation, the abdication made the 21st of June by Louis XVI. of the Crown which had been delegated to him, and to take measures to replace him by all constitutional means; the undersigned declare that they will never recognize Louis XVI. for their king, unless the majority of the nation express a wish contrary to that of the present petition."—Aulard, tome iii., p. 20.

the matter. A large deputation arrived in the Jacobin Convent. The citizens who were there heard the speaker who, in a clever speech, advanced the most severely constitutional principles, and concluded by declaring that the petition ought neither to receive subtraction nor addition. This was received with great applause, and after it had been declared that the citizens assembled there were not holding a meeting of the Friends of the Constitution, but that that Society would hold its meeting in the evening, further discussion was postponed until that time.

“On Saturday evening, the Society met and a very numerous deputation was admitted into a reserved portion of the hall. The citizens who composed it, about two hundred in number, took no part in the deliberations of the Society. Their demand was discussed and after four hours of most thorough discussion, the Society, always mindful of its principles, declared that every citizen who was a Friend of the Constitution ought not to sign the petition presented by the deputation, since in it the words ‘and to take measures to replace him by all constitutional means’ were omitted. The deputation was entirely dissuaded, and the

reply which it addressed contained the recommendation to the citizens to conform to the Constitution.

“At this time a deputy from the National Assembly came suddenly in who gave to the President the text of a decree¹ by which the Assembly had at that instant decided the fate of the King. The decree was read and it was declared that the petition had no longer any place. On Sunday morning, the citizen who had presided (a member of the Society) went to suppress the edition of the petition, while others who had assembled declared that they would go to the Champ-de-Mars in order to inform the citizens who had assembled there of the decree of the previous evening, and of the necessity that now existed of stopping the signing.

“These facts clearly prove that the Society of the Friends of the Constitution has neither proposed, nor drawn up, nor adopted the petition; that it has simply been consulted upon the suppression of a phrase; that its decision has been entirely in conformity with its principles; that it has solemnly and according to its conviction defended the decrees; that its members have stopped the signing; and that all the rest

¹ This is the decree given on page 81.

is the work of citizens who used the meeting-place of the Society to carry out their right of petition ; that their manifest intentions were right ; that they were legally prevented by the Municipality ; that the atrocious crimes committed at the Gros-Caillou¹ are not to be laid to the charge of the citizens who made the petition ; and that all good citizens ought to defend, by the most pronounced testimony of their esteem, a Society all of whose efforts have constantly been directed to establish the Constitution, and whose vigilance has so frequently denounced to the Committees of the National Assembly the enemies of the French People, who are the only ones to be feared and calumniated."

Although in the above statement there is an evident attempt on the part of the Jacobins to shift all responsibility in the affair of the Champ-de-Mars upon other shoulders than their own, yet it is probable that the Club as a whole did not approve of the course taken by the more radical members of their party, and the famous split in the Society, which was the immediate result of this affair, confirms the statement. The real instigators of the affair

¹ Gros-Caillou was an entrance to the Champ-de-Mars.

were undoubtedly Marat, Danton, Desmoulins, and the more radical republicans who had never ceased to cry out, since the King's return from Varennes, that the throne must be abolished.

The so-called "massacre" of the Champ-de-Mars, however, is instructive, since it is the one occasion in the course of the Revolution when the law-and-order party firmly asserted themselves, and, for the moment, their victory was complete. Danton retired to his home at Arcis-sur-Aube, Marat concealed himself, intending to escape to England, Camille Desmoulins suspended the issue of his journal. Had the Constitutionals known how to follow up their victory they might perhaps have firmly re-established Louis on his throne. The schism in the Jacobin Club, which was the result of this affair, caused the more moderate members to withdraw from the Mother Society and form a new Club, which held its meetings in the Convent of the Feuillants and took the name of the "Society of the Friends of the Constitution Meeting at the Feuillants." The only Jacobins of note who remained at the club in the Rue Saint-Honoré were Robespierre, Buzot, Pétion, and Corroller.

The new club soon numbered seven hundred and ninety-eight members, the most prominent among them being Barère, Boissy d'Anglas, Chateauneuf-Randon, Cochon, Dubois-Crancé, Gobel, the Duc d'Orléans, Prieur (de la Marne), Rabaut Saint-Étienne, Sieyès, and Talleyrand. In *Le Babillard* of July 19th we find the following: "Club of the Jacobins.—All the deputies who were members of it, with the exception of Messieurs Robespierre, Buzot, Pétion, Grégoire, and Prieur, have left this Society, which is no longer that of the Friends of the Constitution. They have formed a new one, which holds its meetings at the Feuillants. It is there that the true friends of the Constitution, who have sworn to live to support it and die to defend it, should rally. It is evident that this title does not belong to the factious who have been protesting against the decrees dictated by the constitutional law of the state."

The Constitutional party, however, owing to its want of union and lack of practical ability, failed to reap the fruits of its victory. Many of those who had joined the new club soon left it and returned to the club in the Rue Saint-Honoré. The Jacobin leaders reappeared in public life, and slowly but surely regained their

influence. And the radical republicans never forgot or forgave the "massacre" of the Champ-de-Mars. When their day of triumph came, in '93, it was made the basis of many an accusation; notably in the case of poor old Bailly, whom they guillotined upon the very spot where he had displayed the *Drapeau Rouge*.

On the 20th of April, 1792, King Louis XVI., accompanied by his ministers, appeared in the Assembly, and, having heard a report of General Dumouriez advising the commencement of war with Austria, his Majesty formally proposed that war be declared against the King of Hungary and Bohemia. Thus began that ten years' struggle which was largely instrumental in the final overthrow of the Bourbon monarchy, made possible the Reign of Terror, and ended by placing a "Soldier of Fortune" upon the throne of France. It is interesting to note the circumstances which led to this memorable declaration of war, and the part taken in regard to it by the Jacobins.

The war agitation was a manœuvre on the part of the Girondins, and especially of Brissot, Guadet, and Gensonne, who had conceived the idea that a war would be the most effectual

means of overthrowing the monarchy and establishing a republic. They vigorously attacked the Queen's circle, which they called "the Austrian Committee," and also the Emperor Leopold, the brother of Marie Antoinette, and, by their clamor and their eloquence, soon had a large part of the people of Paris and of France, whose love of military glory has always been easily aroused, loudly demanding war. A portion of the Court party, too, were secretly in sympathy with the Girondin movement, although from a very different motive, since they hoped that by means of a war the King might recover some of his lost authority.

On the 7th of December, 1791, Duportail resigned his position as War Minister and, through the efforts of Madame de Staël,¹ was succeeded by the gay and dashing diplomat, Count Louis de Narbonne. The new Minister of War, though he may have lacked perhaps Segur's ability, was still a very clever man—as he was to prove, in later years, under the Empire—and now felt that he had an oppor-

¹ "Le Comte Louis de Narbonne est enfin ministre de la guerre. Quelle gloire pour Madame de Staël et quel plaisir pour elle d'avoir toute l'armée à elle."—"Marie Antoinette." Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, tome ii., p. 328.

tunity to distinguish himself. He determined to take advantage of the great enthusiasm aroused by the idea of war and, by becoming its champion, draw upon the King and himself the popularity of its promotion. Let it once be thought that the King had become the soul of the war party and perhaps that unfortunate flight to Varennes would be forgotten, and should the war turn out victorious, and Louis the King and Louis Count Narbonne become laurel-crowned heroes, might he not prove himself the "great minister" even as Richelieu and Mazarin had done? But these brilliant dreams were to have a sudden ending for M. de Narbonne. The Emperor Leopold died on the 1st of March, 1792, and on the 9th, as the result of pressure brought to bear upon the King, and largely through the Queen's influence, Narbonne was summarily dismissed from his office. With him went any hope that may have existed of the King's being able to rally the warlike spirits in France about him. Dumouriez became Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the Girondins, who had cried so loudly for war, soon had a larger and more serious war on their hands than they could well manage. The Jacobins, however, from the first,

resolutely and systematically opposed the war.¹ They knew that a war, if successful, would strengthen either its promoters or the executive power, the Girondins or the King, and that, if the strengthening of either of these powers should lead to their own overthrow, there would be immense bloodshed in the attempt. Robespierre, Danton, Collot d'Herbois, Marat, Carra,² Dubois-Crancé, all opposed war vigorously, and the debates upon this subject in the Jacobin Club during the winter of 1791-2, are both interesting and instructive.

On the 16th of December, Brissot, who was the main defender of the war measure, made a speech in its behalf, and Danton refuted his arguments in a powerful reply. On the 19th of December, Billaud-Varenne, that Jacobin of Jacobins, opposed the war, and on the 2d of January, Robespierre, in a lengthy speech and amid great applause, disproved the assertions contained in Brissot's second speech of the 30th of December, in which he had advocated "the necessity of making war against the princes of Germany."³

¹ "La guerre selon les girondins assurera le succès de la révolution, selon les jacobins elle le compromettra."—Sorel, tome ii., p. 314.

² Carra, though a Girondin, opposed the war.

³ Aulard, tome iii., p. 309.

"These sentiments of the extreme Jacobins," says Morse Stephens, "it is most important to notice, for it is generally believed and has often been declared that they were the real authors of the great war which was to change the whole face of Europe."¹

It is impossible within the limits of this paper to dwell upon the affair of the 20th of June, 1792, when the mob, for the first time, invaded the palace of the Tuileries. A most detailed account of the events of that day may be found in M. Mortimer-Ternaux's elaborate *Histoire de la Terreur*.² The King, in the exercise of the right given him by the Constitution, had vetoed two decrees passed by the Assembly, one of which called for the formation of a camp of twenty thousand *fédérés* outside Paris, the other for the exile of all priests who had not taken the constitutional oath, and on the 12th of June he had dismissed the Girondin Ministry. These acts caused great commotion, and had much the same effect upon the people of Paris that Necker's dismissal had had in 1789, although Roland was far from having Necker's popularity, and the

¹ Morse Stephens, *French Revolution*, ii., p. 46.

² Tome i., pp. 115-296.

insurrection of June 20th had been, for some time, premeditated, and, in that respect, differed entirely from the spontaneous rising which, in 1789, led to the fall of the Bastille. Though the Jacobin leaders, Danton and Robespierre, feeling that the time for decisive action against the monarchy had not yet come, discouraged any demonstration, still the events of June 20th, which were mainly planned and carried out by subaltern actors, are significant of the power of the Jacobin party. As a recent English authority upon the Revolution has truly said: "Without the success of the 20th of June it may be doubted at what particular period the actual capture of the Tuileries, which took place on August 10th, would have occurred." ¹

Not the least dramatic incident of that day—when the mob, having presented their petition to the Assembly and filed through its hall, finally forced their way into the palace, and for two hours insulted the King and the royal family—was the appearance of the descendant of the *Grand Monarque* upon the Tuileries' balcony with the *bonnet rouge* upon his head. "On what precise day, during the interval of

¹ Morse Stephens, ii., p. 82.

the fifty days between June 20 and August 10, 1792, the Jacobins decided that an attack should be made on the Tuileries and the royal family finally overthrown, it is impossible to discover, but the first meeting of the Secret Directory of Insurrection, in which the measures to be adopted were discussed, did not take place till July 26th."¹ On the 25th of July, Prussia joined Austria in declaring war, and the Duke of Brunswick issued his famous proclamation, in which he declared that "the inhabitants of cities, towns, or villages, who should defend themselves against the troops of their Imperial and Royal Majesties,² should be punished instantly with all the rigor of the laws of war, and if the palace of the Tuileries were forced or the least insult offered to their Majesties, the King and Queen, the city of Paris should be given up to military execution and total destruction."³

This untimely proclamation defeated its own ends, and, far from terrifying the people of Paris into submission, only roused them to

¹ Morse Stephens, ii., p. 107.

² The King of Prussia and the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Francis did not take the title of "Emperor of Austria" until 1804.

³ This proclamation (dated at Coblenz, July 25th) is given in full by Mortimer-Ternaux, tome ii., pp. 160, 161.

greater fury. It was to no purpose that Louis XVI., on the 3d of August, sent a message to the Assembly disavowing any participation in the Brunswick manifesto;—the fate of the monarchy was sealed. “I have given to the secretary,” said M. Merlin, at the meeting of the Jacobins on July 27th, “the counter-declaration of King Francis to the declaration of war of the King of the French. We can perceive from that document that it is Louis XVI., alone, who is the author of all our misfortunes; that it is for Louis XVI., alone, and the honor of crowned heads, that the allied powers are armed against us.”¹ At the meeting of the Jacobins on the 29th of July, the speech of M. Anthoine, in which he demanded the King’s dethronement and expressed his views regarding the results which, he hoped, that event would bring about, called forth great applause. “As long as we do not demand the dethronement of Louis XVI.,” he said, “we do nothing for liberty. With the dethronement of the King, therefore, I demand that of his family, in short a reformation of the executive power; and my demand is constitutional. The unity of that power is constitutional. Dethrone-

¹ Aulard, tome iv., p. 146.

ment is urgent, and then the safety of the people will be established. The Austrians and Prussians will return to the Elbe ; when we shall no longer have a king, they will no longer make war on us ; they will abandon the cause of the nobles, who will, one by one, return, or, do what would be vastly better, remain in eternal exile.”¹

On the 30th of July, the battalion of the Marseillais, five hundred strong, who had left Marseilles on July 2d, marched into Paris singing Rouget de Lisle's immortal song—soon to become the battle-hymn of the new French Republic—“*Allons, enfants de la patrie, le jour du gloire est arrivé !*” They were soon involved in a contest with the National Guards² which might have resulted in an attack on the Tuileries, but order was restored, and though the King's downfall did not immediately follow the first singing of the *Marseillaise* in Paris, yet that downfall was fully decided upon. It was simply a question of organizing a sufficiently thorough insurrection to make success certain, and to that end the Jacobin

¹ Aulard, tome iv., pp. 156-158.

² “ Les Marseillais arrivent dans la capitale (30 Juillet), ils entrent à une heure et à cinq heures le sang des gardes nationaux a coulé.”—Montgaillard, *Histoire de France*, tome iv., p. 137.

leaders applied themselves with vigor. It was at the instigation of Danton that the Paris sections voted the dethronement of the King.¹

On the 31st^{*} of July, the section Mauconseil² drew up the following petition, which was presented to the Assembly: "Considering that it is impossible to save liberty by the Constitution, that we cannot recognize the Constitution as an expression of the general will, and that Louis XVI. has lost the confidence of the nation, we consequently declare in the most authentic and solemn manner, to all our brothers, that we will no longer recognize Louis XVI. as King of the French."³ Although M. Carra declared that this petition had received the approval of a majority of the sections of Paris, such was not the case. Out of the forty-eight Paris sections, only fourteen signed the petition, sixteen rejected it, ten passed it by in silence, and for the remaining eight, documents

¹ "La Gironde avait préparé le terrain du combat, la déclaration de Brunswick offrit le prétexte de l'agression. Aussitôt sous l'impulsion de Danton les sections de Paris votèrent la déchéance du Roi."—Sorel, tome ii., p. 513.

² "Cette section, qui se tenait, en 1792, dans l'église Saint-Jacques-l'Hôpital, comprenait 1700 citoyens actifs."—Mortimer-Ternaux, tome ii., p. 423 (note).

³ *Ibid.*, tome ii., p. 174.

are wanting to prove their action.¹ It was publicly declared, by the sections Quinze-Vingts² and Mauconseil, that, if the Assembly did not adopt the petition by the night of August 9th, the petitioners would appear on August 10th, *en masse*, and back their demands by force of arms. Some of the more violent republicans attempted to declare the insurrection on the 8th of August at the meeting of the Jacobins,³ but more prudent members prevented the project, believing that it was better to wait until the day which the sections Quinze-Vingts and Mauconseil had pompously fixed as the "extreme limit of popular patience" (*terme extrême de patience populaire*).⁴ The day of the 9th of August, therefore, was entirely taken up by preparations for attack, and, the Assembly having adjourned the question of dethronement, the armed sections prepared to carry out their plans. Danton and Desmoulins were occupied during a great part of the night in haranguing the Marseillais and the inhab-

¹ Mortimer-Ternaux, tome ii., p. 443 (note).

² "Cette section se tenait, en 1792, dans l'église des Enfants-Trouvés et comprenait 2000 citoyens actifs."—*Ibid.*, tome ii., p. 427.

³ See *Séance du Mercredi 8 Août*, 1792.—Aulard, tome iv., pp. 186-191.

⁴ Mortimer-Ternaux, tome ii., p. 216.

itants of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine. The Revolutionary Commune, the *enfant terrible* of the Jacobin Society, as M. Schmidt¹ calls it, established itself at the Hôtel-de-Ville, and declared the Paris Municipality suspended from its powers. At midnight the tocsin was sounded, and at eight o'clock on the morning of the 10th of August, Westermann² prepared to lead his forces against the palace of the Tuileries. What means of resistance had royalty, in its last struggle for existence, against the ever-growing insurrection?

The defence of the Tuileries had been intrusted to M. Mandat, who had, as his assistants, the Baron de Viomenil and M. d'Herilly. It was Mandat's special purpose to gather about the palace those battalions of the National Guard—about two thousand strong—upon whose loyalty to the monarchy he thought he could rely, but he placed his confidence chiefly in the faithful Swiss Guards of the King, for although by the decree of July 17th they had been ordered to leave Paris, they had gone only as far as their barracks at Courbevoie, and hence were recalled, on the 8th of August, by the Minister of War. With

¹ A. Schmidt, *Tableaux de la Révolution Française*, p. 83.

the National battalions in the garden of the Tuileries, the Swiss Guards in the Place du Carrousel and in the interior of the palace, and his reserve of gunners on the bridges and at the Pont Neuf, M. Mandat, therefore, felt confident in his ability to hold his own. At half-past six in the morning he received an order from Pétion, Mayor of Paris, to present himself at the Hôtel-de-Ville,—an order which, unfortunately for himself and his cause, he obeyed, only to meet a swift death at the hands of exasperated insurgents on the Place de Grève. Thus royalty, deprived of its last able man, had to prepare as best it could to face the coming storm.

But had French royalty, now at its last gasp, no other defenders than the foreign mercenaries in the Place du Carrousel and the lukewarm National Guards in the Tuileries' gardens? Yes, a few, and as M. d'Hervilly ordered the usher to open the door of the council-chamber to the "French nobility," they entered—to attend royalty's last levee. "Two hundred persons entered the room nearest to that in which the royal family were," says Madame Campan. "I saw few people belonging to the court, many whose features

were unknown to me, and some who figured technically without right among what was called the *noblesse*, but whose self-devotion ennobled them at once. They were all so badly armed that, even in that situation, the indomitable French liveliness indulged in jests.”¹ A very different assemblage truly, from the glittering crowd that, in the old days at Versailles, filled the *Œil-de-Bœuf*² to overflowing when De Brézé,³ throwing open the doors of the royal bedchamber, was wont to announce in pompous tones, “*Messieurs, le Roi vous accorde les grandes entrées.*” (Gentlemen, the King grants you the grand entrance.) Where were the de Brissacs, de Besenvals, de Polignacs, d’Adhémar, de Coignys, de Vaudreuil,⁴ and all the rest who, in the heyday of the monarchy, had drawn so freely from its favors?—Gone. Some were with d’Artois at Coblenz, some at Vienna, and some following at the heels of Brunswick’s

¹ Madame Campan, *Mémoires de Marie Antoinette*, p. 371.

² The *Œil-de-Bœuf* was an antechamber in which the nobility awaited the King at Versailles.

³ M. de Brézé was Grand Master of Ceremonies before the Revolution.

⁴ See article, “Le Petit Trianon,” by Pierre de Nolhac, in *L’Art et Lettres*, 1889, for the French nobles who figured most prominently in the society of Trianon.

army hoping, by means of foreign bayonets, to regain positions which they might never have lost had they known how to remain and defend them.¹

About half-past seven the advance guard of the sections began to fill the Place du Carrousel and, though they made some tumult and cried loudly "Down with M. Veto!" they were not, strictly speaking, the insurrectionary army which was then forming at the Hôtel-de-Ville. It was shortly after eight o'clock when the King, after some hesitation, decided to follow the advice given him by M. Roederer,

¹ "Who reasoned out the emigration? It has oftentimes been asked how so extraordinary a resolution came to be taken; how it had entered the minds of men gifted with a certain amount of sense that there was any advantage to be derived from abandoning all the posts where they could still exercise power; of giving over to the enemy the regiments they commanded, the localities over which they had control; of delivering up completely to the teachings of the opposite party the peasantry, over whom, in a goodly number of provinces, a valuable influence might be exerted, and among whom they still had many friends,—and all this, to return for the purpose of conquering, at the sword's point, positions, a number of which at least could be held without a fight. The voluntary going into exile of nearly the whole nobility of France, of many magistrates, of a large number of women and children,—this resolve, without a precedent in history, was not conceived and determined upon as a state measure; chance brought it about. A few, in the first instance, followed the princes who had been obliged, on the 14th of July, to seek safety out of France, and others followed them."—*Memoirs of Chancellor Pasquier*, i., p. 64.

the *procureur-général-syndic*, and seek a refuge in the Assembly. The royal family, therefore, escorted by three hundred of the National Guards, crossed the Tuileries' garden and entered the Assembly-hall, where the King informed the members that he had come there to "avoid a great crime,"¹ and the President assured him that he could rely upon the firmness of the Assembly. The insurrectionary army arrived on the Place du Carrousel and, about half-past ten,² opened fire upon the Château. The Swiss Guards answered promptly, and after the combat had lasted some three quarters of an hour, M. d'Hervilly arrived bringing an order from the King to the Swiss to cease firing and withdraw. In obedience to this command, therefore, the Swiss evacuated the palace and, under a heavy fire, crossed the Tuileries' garden, few, however, escaping the mounted gendarmes who charged them and cut them to pieces on the Place Louis Quinze. They were royalty's best defenders, and a young Corsican lieutenant, who had watched the fight from a window in the house of the

¹ "Le Roi—Je suis venu ici pour éviter un grand crime.

"M. le Président—Vous pouvez, sire, compter sur la fermeté de l'Assemblée."—*Le Moniteur Universel* (réimpression), No. 225.

² Mortimer-Ternaux, tome ii., p. 322 (note).

sieur de Bourrienne,¹ on the Place du Carrousel, gave it as his opinion that the Swiss, if properly commanded, would have won. The mob advanced slowly as the Swiss Guards retired, and entered the palace five minutes after² the last companies had abandoned it, so that, upon this memorable 10th of August, "the palace of the Tuileries," as M. Mortimer-Ternaux says, "was not captured by armed force, but abandoned by order of Louis XVI."³

The insurgents proceeded at once to celebrate their triumph. They rushed through the palace, breaking and throwing out of the windows all objects that reminded them of a detested royalty. Even the mirrors did not escape their fury, for, said they, "the Medici-Antoinette⁴ has too long studied in them the hypocritical air which she displayed in public." The dead bodies of the Swiss, cut and dragged about the Tuileries' garden, were treated with every indignity, and the mob finished their high car-

¹ Bourrienne, i., p. 17.

² Mortimer-Ternaux, tome ii., p. 325.

³ *Ibid.*, ii., p. 325.

⁴ "Medici-Antoinette y avait étudié trop longtemps l'air hypocrite qu'elle montrait en public."—Prudhomme, *Révolutions de Paris*, tome xiii., p. 236.

nival by setting fire to a portion of the palace.¹ Over at the Assembly, the King listened to the decree which suspended him from his functions, —a decree which, curiously enough, was signed by his own Minister of Justice (Dejoly), who affixed to it the seal of state.² So ended the 10th of August, and with it the monarchy of the Bourbons. The crown of France lay trampled on the ground, and there it was to lie until the day when the young Corsican lieutenant, having added to his name the brilliant synonyms of Arcola, Rivoli, and Marengo, and become Bonaparte, First Consul, should “pick it up with the point of his sword.”³ The weeks which immediately followed the victory of August 10th were full of excitement. Girondins and Jacobins divided the spoils. Roland and his friends returned to office, and Danton became Minister of Justice and, for a time, the most important man in France. But these two rival powers could not long continue

¹ “Le château des Tuileries était à la disposition des citoyens, déjà les bâtimens qui séparent les Tuileries de la place du Carrousel sont en feu, l’indignation s’acharne aveuglement sur tous les meubles renversés dans le château.”—*Le Moniteur Universel*, No. 225.

² Mortimer-Ternaux, tome ii., p. 344.

³ “J’ai trouvé la couronne de France par terre, et je l’ai ramassée avec la pointe de mon épée.”—Napoléon, in *Mémoires de Madame de Rémusat*, tome i., p. 380.

side by side, and the warfare which soon began between the Girondins and the Jacobins ended, in 1793, with the *Coup d'État* of June 2d and the fall of the Gironde. The triumphant Jacobins, through the great Committee of Public Safety,¹ which was established in April, 1793, became the masters of France.

The struggle for supremacy now became an internal strife in the Jacobin party itself,—a strife in which the Hebertists, who represented the more radical and violent spirits, and the Dantonists, who were the more moderate members (at the period of the Terror), were crushed, each in turn; leaving the supreme power in the hands of the middle party, the Robespierrists, and the spring of 1794—the period of the greatest Jacobin influence—was also the period which marked the height of power attained by the most conspicuous Jacobin leader, Maximilien Robespierre. From the 20th Prairial

¹ "Après le vote de ce décret, la Convention procéda immédiatement à la nomination des neuf membres du Comité. Barère obtient 360 voix, Delmas 347, Bréard 325, Cambon 278, Danton 233, Jean de Bry 227, Guyton-Morveau 202, Tréilhard 167, Delacroix (d'Eure-et-Loir) 151. La première séance du Comité de Salut Public eut lieu le 7 avril (1793); quelques heures après la nomination de ses membres. Tous, sauf Tréilhard, y assistaient. Guyton-Morveau fut nommé président, sans doute en qualité de doyen d'âge; Bréard vice-président, Barère et Lindet secrétaires."—Gros, *Le Comité de Salut Public*, pp. 31 and 39.

(June 8th), 1794, the day of Robespierre's greatest triumph, when, with a docile convention at his heels, he inaugurated the *fête* of his "Supreme Being," in the Tuileries' garden, there were some fifty days until the wheel of fortune had brought about the "Thermidor,"¹ and he lay, crushed and bleeding, upon a table in the Hôtel-de-Ville, within a few hours of his scaffold, an object of derision to a mob that had long been his worshippers.²

"If the life of Robespierre in the Year Two," says d'Héricault, "demonstrates that he did not wish to end the Terror (to the proofs found on every page of this book [his *Révolution de Thermidor*] we can add a hundred others, and his speech of the 8th Thermidor does not leave the least doubt on the subject), on the other hand, in that very speech we notice traces of a less violent tone, we find ourselves lost in the midst of contrary affirmations—the words of Freron, of Billaud, of Allonville, of Beaulieu—which are truly in favor of the *avocat* of Arras. What are we to

¹ July 27-28, 1794.

² "On le trouva étendu dans une salle voisine du lieu des séances. On dit qu'en l'apercevant, un des patriotes s'approcha vivement, le regarda fixement et s'écria : 'Oui, Robespierre, il est un Être suprême.'"—D'Héricault, *La Révolution de Thermidor*, p. 500.

conclude from these contradictory statements, all authentic? We can only infer, as we have shown, that Robespierre desired to mitigate the Terror somewhat at the same time preserving it,—in short, that Robespierre wished to regulate the Terror. This is the key to the history of Robespierre and of the revolution of Thermidor; it explains all apparent contradictions, it conciliates opposing theories, and without it nothing can be rightly comprehended.”¹ It may have been as d’Héricault has stated; it may have been, on the other hand, that he was hoping by a swift removal of his enemies to end the Terror and that, by a curious combination of events, his own downfall ended that which he was seeking to overthrow. What his real purpose was, what plans were revolving in his mind during the last weeks of his life, history will probably never know. One thing is certain: *La Terreur* was ended by the “Thermidor.”

The first blows of the Thermidorian reaction fell naturally upon the Jacobins. On the 11th of November, 1794, the Committees of Government closed their Club, and on the following day the Convention approved that action in the decree here given: “The National Con-

¹ D’Héricault, *La Révolution de Thermidor*, pp. 367, 368.

vention, having heard the report which has been made in the name of the Committees of Public Safety, General Security, War, and Legislation, upon the Society of the Jacobins, decides that it approves the measures taken by the four united Committees as contained in the following decree: 21st Brumaire, Year III., of the French Republic, one and indivisible; the Committees of General Security, Public Safety, Legislation, and War, united, decree: 1st. The meetings of the Society of the Jacobins of Paris are suspended. 2d. In consequence, the meeting-hall of that Society shall be instantly closed and the keys deposited at the secretary's office of the Committee of General Security. 3d. The commission of administrative police is charged with the execution of the present decree. 4th. They will, to-morrow, render an account of the present decree to the National Convention."¹ Thus after an existence of nearly four years the famous Jacobin Club of the Rue Saint-Honoré came to an end.

According to the Jacobin doctrine, all power was vested in the sovereign people, who, in theory, like the king of England, "could do no wrong." Hence popular movements, though

¹ Aulard, tome i., p. 51.

often resulting in violence and bloodshed, must not be interfered with because they were but the will of the sovereign people in "sacred right of insurrection." Naturally such theories appealed strongly to the common people of that day. They had long been regarded as of no consequence in the state,—useful only to pay taxes, to which end they had had to direct all their energies. When one day, therefore, they were told that they were sovereigns in whom all power was vested, that they had a "sacred right of insurrection," that those who opposed any expression of their will were traitors, and that it was their business to watch, with a suspicious eye, over their agents who governed for them, they eagerly embraced these doctrines which seemed to promise them so much and, in their wild desire for liberty, rushed headlong into anarchy.

There were some few attempts on the part of the Jacobins to rally after their overthrow. In 1798, some of the old members of the Club, together with some of the members of the Club of the Pantheon, attempted to form a political club which met, for a few weeks, in the Rue du Bac.¹ The Directory, however, speedily closed

¹ Aulard, tome i., p. 53.

it and ordered the preparation of a law regarding political societies,—a law which was still unfinished when the *Coup d'État* of the 18th Brumaire gave to France a master and one who did not permit any political society to revive. For Frenchmen, then, the days of clubs and debates were over. Henceforth they were to march, at the command of an imperious captain, straight forward, under the mysterious spell of that which was, in a sense, their watchword, and, in the end, alone remained to them for all their blood and triumphs,—Glory.

INDEX.

- Aiguillon, Duc d', 60, 66.
Allmain, doctor in the Paris University, 19.
Amaury, Nicholas, 59.
Anthoine, his speech, 100.
- Bailly, 66, 82, 93.
Barère, 67, 92.
Barnave, 60, 67, 71.
Beauharnais, 67.
Billaud-Varenne, 67 ; his speech, 78 ; 96.
Boissy d'Anglas, 92.
Bonaparte, Napoleon, 67, 108, 110, 116.
Breton Club, 58 ; its members, 60.
Briçonnet, Guillaume, bishop of Meaux, 21-23, 33, 3 .
Brune, 67.
Brunswick, Duke of, his proclamation, 99.
- Café Amaury, 59.
Carra, 79, 96, 102.
Champ-de-Mars, affair of the, 82-84, 91.
Charles V. of Spain, 26, 28, 36.
Chenaux, his speech, 79, 80.
Clement VII., pope, 38.
Cloots, 67.
Collot d'Herbois, 68, 96.
Corroller, 61.
- Danton, 75, 78, 81, 84, 85, 91, 96, 98, 103, 110.

David, painter, 69.

De Roma, Dominican monk, 32.

Desmeuniers, 81.

Desmoulins, 68, 78, 91, 103.

Du Bellay, Guillaume, 41.

Du Bourg, Jean, 46. *

Dumouriez, 93, 95.

Duportail, 94.

Expiatory procession, 47, 48.

Farel, Guillaume, his birth and family, 6 ; meets Lefèvre, 8 ; the Luther of France, 13 ; causes Lefèvre to abandon saint-worship, 19 ; 22 ; goes to Switzerland, 36 ; his character, 51.

Ferdinand the Catholic, 14.

Francis I., 15, 22 ; his birth and character, 25-28 ; 36, 40, 41, 44 ; his speech, 48, 49.

Girondins, their attitude toward the war, 93, 94 ; their fall, 111.

Gower, Lord, English Ambassador, his letter concerning affair of Champ-de-Mars, 83, 84.

Grégoire, Abbé, 60, 68, 75, 92.

Henry IV. of France, 25, 57, 72.

Henry VIII. of England, 14, 27.

Jacobins, Club of the, origin, 58 ; place of meeting, 62, 63 ; its objects and purposes, 64 ; its officers and rules, 65, 66 ; branch societies of, 70 ; begins the second revolutionary movement, 73 ; passes decree concerning Mirabeau, 74 ; growth of power of, 75 ; its part in the affair of the Champ-de-Mars, 85-90 ; the schism in the club, 91, 92 ; its attitude toward the war, 96, 97 ; divides the spoils after August 10th, 110 ; internal strife in, 111 ; closed by the Committees of Government, 113 ; its doctrines, 114, 115 ; its attempt to rally, 115.

Julius II., pope, 14.

La Chapelier, 60.

Lacoste, Marquis de, 60.

Lafayette, 71, 82.

Lameth, Charles and Alexander, 60, 68, 71.

La Révellière-Lépeaux, 60.

Lavalette, 68.

Lefèvre, Jacques, his birth and education, 4 ; his works, 5 ; his appearance, 6 ; completes Latin commentary upon the Psalms, 9 ; publishes commentary upon the Epistles of St. Paul, 10 ; announces cardinal doctrine of the Reformation, 13 ; condemned by the Sorbonne, 21 ; goes to Meaux, 22 ; translates the Bible, 29 ; writes to Farel, 31 ; becomes intimidated, 36 ; his lack of courage, 39 ; his death, 40 ; his character, 51, 52.

Legendre, 68.

Leo X. (Giovanni de' Medici), 14.

Louis XII., 6, 14, 24.

Louis XIV. (Le Grand Monarque), 50, 98.

Louis XVI., his character, 76, 77 ; his flight to Varennes, 78 ; declares war against Austria, 93 ; dismisses the Girondin Ministry, 97 ; leaves the Tuileries, 107.

Louisa of Savoy, 23, 37.

Luther, Martin, 13, 18 ; posts his ninety-five theses, 20 ; at Diet of Worms, 34 ; 51 ; his influence on the French Reformation, 52, 53.

Maintenon, Madame de, 50.

Mandat, his defence of the Tuileries, 104, 105.

Marat, 78, 91, 96.

Margaret of Angoulême, 23 ; her birth and education, 24, 25 ; 40.

Marseillais, battalion of the, 101.

Mauconseil, section, their petition, 102, 103.

Maximilian, King of the Romans, 14.

Melanchthon, Philip, 41.

Merlin, his speech, 100.

Michael Angelo, 14.

Milon, Barthélemi, 45.

Mirabeau, 60, 68, 71 ; his death, 73 ; Louis XVI.'s opinion of him, 76.

Narbonne, Louis de, 94, 95.

Necker, 61, 97.

Nostradamus, 15.

Olivetanus, Robert, Bible of, 30.

Orléans, Duc d', 61, 69, 78, 92.

Orléans, Louis Philippe d', 68.

Paul III., pope, 49.

Pavia, battle of, 36.

Pétion, 60, 68, 75, 91, 92.

Placards, Year of the, 41.

Rabaut Saint-Étienne, 69, 92.

Raphael, 14.

Réal, 69.

Robespierre, Maximilien, 60, 69, 74, 84, 91, 92, 96, 98 ; his rise to power, 111 ; comment of d' Héricault upon him, 112, 113.

Sieyès, 60, 92.

Sorbonne, foundation of, 3 ; condemns Luther's works, 20 ; condemns Lefèvre, 21 ; causes Francis to prohibit printing, 44.

St. Anthony, arm of, 16.

St. Bartholomew, massacre of, 50.

St. Dionysius, body of, 15.

St. Stephen, stones that killed, 16.

States-General of France, opening of, 57.

Surriano, Michel, Venetian Ambassador, 16.

Talleyrand, 92.

Tallien, 69.

Talma, actor, 69.

University of Paris, its origin, 3.

Vernet, Carle, 69.

Vio, Thomas de, cardinal, 19.

Volney, 60.



